James Smith
R. 5. 25.

SIR

LUCIUS CARY,

LATE LORD VISCOUNT OF FALKLAND,

His Discourse of *INFALLIBILITY*, with an Answer to it: And his Lordships *REPLY*.

Never before published.

Together with Mr. *Walter Mountague's* Letter concerning the changing his Religion.

Answered by my Lord of FALKLAND.

LONDON

Printed by *Gartrude Dawson*, for *John Hardesty*, and are to be sold at the Signe of the *Black Spread-Eagle*, in *Duck-Lane*, 1651.

~~1688:12~~
73-5209.

To the Right Honourable, Henry *Lord Viſcount of* Falkland, *my Honourable Lord.*

My Lord,

NOt long before the death of that incomparable perſon, your Lordſhips Mother, that great example of piety and humility, the Lady *Viſcounteſſe of Falkland*, ſhe was pleaſed to commit to my hand that, which ſhe believed, next her Children, the deareſt pledge of her dead Lord; ſome excellent Monuments of his *Reaſon*, *Wit*, and *Induſtry*; in the ſearch of that, which he would have as gladly found, as he hath

rationally rejected, an *Infallible Iudge* here on Earth in all our Controverſies in point of Religion, of which the labouring world ſeemeth at preſent to ſtand in ſo much need. I have conſidered often of that ſingular truſt and friendſhip, in making me the depoſitarie of ſo rich a Jewell: And ſince ſhe, from whoſe hands I received it, is gone thither, where ſhe ſtands in no need of theſe diſcourſes, I know no perſon living that hath more right to it then your Lordſhip, or indeed to whom I would more willingly offer it. For though your Lordſhip be now out of my immediate charge and Tuition, yet as long as it ſhall pleaſe God to make me able to do, or point at any thing that may, though never ſo little, helpe forward to perfect a good work in you, I ſhall never account my ſelfe diſobliged. I muſt profeſſe to all the World, that there is no Family now in being, to which I owe more true ſervice, then to your Lordſhips: And ſhall to the utmoſt of my power, upon all

all occaſions make it good. I have nothing left me but a poor thankfull heart, which hath been my onely ſure Companion, when all things elſe have forſaken me: That ſtill remaines ἀσύλητόν τι and κτῆμα εἰς ἀεί, being neither in the power of time nor perſons to ſpoile me of that, which like a good Conſcience to my ſelf, muſt to my friends be the beſt feaſt I can make them.

My Lord, my deſign is not by this to ingage your Lordſhip in this *Polemicall* diſcourſe, nor my ſelf neither, having neither ability nor leaſure for a buſineſs of that concern, and by reaſon of my buſie imployment, I had not been able to have preſented it thus to your Lordſhip, without the aſſiſtance of Judicious Friends, that honour the work for the Authors ſake, and the Author for his owne.

But, My Lord, I hope I ſhall have my end in it however, an end which no good man will envy me, namely, an occaſion hereby to reminde your Lordſhip of the Gallant Author, your Noble Father, that by

by propoſingHim to you as your conſtant Coppy, you may do Him an honour beyond all his Friends: For while they *praiſe*, you may *imitate* him.

Indeed, it is one of the greateſt comforts I have in this calamitous life, to remember, that I had the honour to be ſo neare Him: And a reproach, which I cannot clear my ſelf of, to have been at the ſame time ſo neare, and ſo farr off; ſo neare in Converſation, and yet ſo farr removed from him in thoſe Excellencies, whereby he was the envy of this Age, and will be the wonder of the next.

His *Religion*, (for that I ſhould begin with) was the more Eminent, becauſe the more Early, at that age, when yong Gallants think leaſt on it? When they, yong Candidates of Atheiſme begin to diſpute themſelves out of a beleefe of a *Deity*, urging hard againſt that, which indeed is beſt for them that it ſhould never be, *a Iudgement to come*; then, I ſay, that ſalvation which theſe mention with a ſcoff or a Jeere, he began to work out with fear

fear and trembling, and *effectually* to remember, that is, *to honour and ſerve* his Creator in the daies of his youth.

In the next place, I may not forget his vaſt *naturall parts*: *Dixit ex tempore* ſaith *Pliny* of *Iſæus*, *ſed tanquam diu ſcripſerit*, , and I may truely apply it to him, his Anſwers were quick and ſuddain, but ſuch, as might very well ſeem to have been meditated. In ſhort, his *abilities* were ſuch, as though he needed no ſupplies of *induſtry*, yet his *induſtry* ſuch as though he had had no *parts* at all. How often have I heard him pitty thoſe Hawking and Hunting Gentlemen, who if unſeaſonable weather for their ſports had betrayed them to keep home, without a worſe exerciſe within doores, could not have told how to have ſpent their time: And all becauſe they were ſuch ſtrangers to ſuch *good Companions*, with whom he was ſo familiar, ſuch as neither cloy nor weary any, with whom they converſe, ſuch company as *Eraſmus*, a perſon much eſteemed by my Lord your Father, ſo much extolls in his 31, and 35, Epiſtle of his fourth

Book

Book : Not friends of the Cellar, or the Kitchin; τὰ ἄλλα δὲ χορήγων ἐδὲν διαφέροντες, indeed their *owne* friends rather then *his* who entertaineth them : But ſuch, as being bidden, are ready, uninvited intrude not, that bite no mans meat or reputation, ſilent, not ſpoken to, ſpoken to, ſpeak as we pleaſe, what we pleaſe, how long and how much we pleaſe : Candidly communicating themſelves to us without betraying our ſecrets committed to them; that ſtill tell us ſomewhat that may delight us for its Antiquitie, pleaſe us for its Novelty, or ſome way or other enrich our knowledge. While others ſtudied the *Heraldry* of Horſes, of Doggs, or at the beſt their owne: He, though not inferior to his Neighbours in Deſcent, and Honour, knowing well how much more glorious it is to be the firſt then the laſt of a Noble Family, (Blood without Vertue making Vice but more conſpicuous) was ſo farr from relying upon that empty Title, that He ſeemed *Ipſe ſuos genuiſſe Parentes*, to have *begotten* his Anceſtors, and to have given them

them a more illuſtrious life, then he re-
cieved from them.

Though there were as much true
worth cloſely treaſured up in him, as
well divided, had been able to have ſet
up a hundred *Pretenders*, yet ſo much
Modeſty withall, that the hearing of
any thing was more pleaſing to him then
one tittle of his owne praiſe.

This Vertue was indeed in a high
degree in him, and ſhewed it ſelfe
upon all occaſions. If any thing, though
never ſo little unhandſomely, had been
ſpoken or done where he was, he
was the greateſt ſufferer in the com-
pany, and much more out of coun-
tenance then he that made the offence
And ſurely he that was ſo tender of ano-
ther mans *Civility*, may very juſtly be
preſumed to have had a great regard to his
owne. And ſo he had indeed. For
though his *Courage* were as great as his
Wit and his *Learning*, (and that is ex-
preſſion high enough) his *Valour* ſo un-
daunted and dreadleſſe, as his grea-

fall witneſt, ἐν πολυφθόρῳ Διὸς ὄμβρῳ χὐ χαλαζαίῃ φόνῳ, In that fatall Haile that made more Orphans then his Children: Yet to do an ill or an uncivill thing, he was an arrant Coward: Though he was of *Davids* Stature, of his Courage too, μορφὰν βραχὺς ψυχὰν δὲ ἄχαμπτος, and in this moſt like him, afraid of nothing but to offend.

But what needs any body plead for his *Civility* more then this preſent Diſcourſe, where he excels his *Antagoniſt* in that, as well as in reaſon, and ſhewes that a *Gentleman* writ with a *Scholars* Pen.

Before I ſhut up all, my Lord, one Vertue there is yet to be mentioned, which of all that ever had relation to his Lordſhip, I may not, I muſt not ever forget, and that was his *Friendſhip*. That is a Vertue, which by the unintermitted affliction of my life, I have had more then ordinary occaſion to make uſe of. And that I muſt needs ſay was it, which made all his other Graces and Excellencies reliſh to me, He being the deareſt and

and the trueſt Friend, that through the whole courſe of my unhappy life I ever had the happineſſe to meet with.

If it be a kind of pleaſure to reade diſcourſes of Friends and Friendſhip, What is it to enjoy ſuch a Friend in whom really was, what Excellencie either Hiſtory can record, or almoſt Poëtry faine?

Nothing ſo hard in *Lucians Toxaris*, that he durſt not do, and nothing ſo handſome in all *Seneca's* Lawes of *Benefits*, that he knew not how to do, and to out-do for his Friend.

Let your Vertuous and dear Grandmother, my Lord, and all your Kindred yet alive, ſpeak to this: And your bleſſed Mother were ſhe now alive, would ſay, ſhe had the beſt of Friends before the beſt of Husbands. This was it that made *Tew* ſo valued a Manſion to us: For as when we went from *Oxford* thither, we found our ſelves never out of the Univerſitie: So we thought our ſelves never abſent from our own beloved home. But I dare ſay no more of this, it being

 now

now a mellancholy thing, I am ſure to me, to call back into my memory happineſſe never to be recalled, and to afflict my ſelf anew with the conſideration of what felicity I have out-lived.

Your Lordſhip is now the onely ſurviving pledge of that admired Father, of whom-when we his poor ſervants have ſaid all we can, the Character will be farr too ſhort. It is in you, and onely you, my Lord to ſet him out truely, and to reſemble him to the life, and that will be by taking that Evangelicall Counſell, *Tu autem fac ſimiliter*: Do like him, live like him, and pardon me if I add one thing more, like him, Love

My Lord,

Your Lordſhips moſt

humble and affectionately

devoted Servant,

TRIPLET.

The Preface to the Reader.

THe eminent abilities in the moſt noble Author of the enſuing learned Diſcourſe, and learneder Reply, can ſcarcely be imagined unknown to any whom this language can reach: But if any ſuch there be, I ſhall deſire them to learne the perfections of that moſt excellent Perſon, rather from the Dedication, then this Preface; the deſigne of which, is onely to give the Reader ſome ſatisfaction concerning the nature of this Controverſie in it ſelfe, and of theſe Diſſertations in particular.

The Romiſh Doctrine of their owne Infallibility, as it is the moſt generall Controverſie betweene them, and all other Churches excluded by them from their Communion: So it is of ſuch a comprehenſive nature, that being once proved and

clearely demonſtrated, it would without queſtion draw all other Churches ſo excluded, to a moſt humble ſubmiſsion and acknowledgement, nay, to an earneſt deſire of a ſuddaine Reconciliation upon any Termes whatſoever. For howſoever they pleaſe to ſpeak and write of our Hereticall and obſtinate perſiſtance in manifeſt Errors, yet I hope they cannot ſeriouſly thinke we would be ſo irrationall, as to contradict him whom we our ſelves think beyond a poſsibillity of erring, and to diſpute perpetually with them, whom onely to heare were to be ſatisfied.

But when they have propounded their Deciſions to be beleeved, and imbraced by us as Infallibly true, and that becauſe they propound them, who in their own opinion are Infallible; if notwithſtanding ſome of thoſe Deciſions ſeeme to us to be evidently falſe, becauſe clearely contradictory to that which they themſelves propound as infallibly true, that is the Word of God: ſurely we cannot be blamed, if we have deſired their Infallibility to be moſt clearly demonſtrated, at leaſt to a higher degree of evidence then we have of the contradiction of their Deciſions to the infallible Rule. Wherefore, The great Defenders of the Doctrine of the Church of England, *have with more then ordi-*

dinary

nary diligence endeavoured to view the grounds of this Controverſie, and have written by the advantage either of their learning accurately, or of their parts moſt ſtrongly, or of the cauſe it ſelfe moſt convincingly, againſt that darling Infallibility. How clearely this Controverſie hath been managed, with what evidence of truth diſcuſſed, what ſucceſſe ſo much of reaſon hath had, cannot more plainly appeare then in this, that the very name of Infallibility before ſo much exalted, begins now to be very burthenſome, even to the maintainers of it: Inſomuch as one of their lateſt and ableſt Proſelytes, Hugh Paulin de Creſſy, *lately Dean of* Laghlin, &c. *in* Ireland, *and Prebendary of* Windſor *in* England, *in his Exomologeſis, or faithfull Narration of the occaſion and motives of his Converſion, hath dealt very clearly with the World, and told us, that this* Infallibilitie is an unfortunate Word. *That* Mr. *Chillingworth* hath cumbated againſt it with too too great ſucceſſe, *ſo great, that* he could wiſh the Word were forgotten, or at leaſt layd by. *That not onely Mr.* Chillingworth, *whom he ſtill worthily admires; but we the reſt of the poore* Proteſtants have in very deed, very much

to say for our selves, when we are pressed unnecessarily with it. *And therefore Mr.* Cressy's *advise to all the* Romanists *is this, that* we may never be invited to combat the authority of the Church under that notion. *Oh the strength of Reason rightly managed! O the power of Truth clearly declared! that it should force an eminent member of the Church of* Rome (*whose great Principle is non-retractation*) *to retract so necessary, so fundamentall a Doctrine, to desert all their Schooles, and contradict all their Controvertists. But indeed not without very good cause: For he professes withall,* that no such word as Infallibility is to be found in any Councel: Neither did ever the Church enlarge her Authority to so vaste a wideneſſe: But doth rather deliver the victory into our hands when we urge her Decisions. *In all which Confessions, although he may seeme onely to speak of the* Word, *yet that cannot be it which he is so wearie of, because we except not against the word at all, but confesse it rightly to signifie that which we impugne, neither do we ever bring any nominall Argument against it. But as when Cardinall* Bellarmine *sets downe*

the

the Doctrine of the Church in their positive tearmes. Summus Pontifex, cum totam Ecclesiam docet, in his, quæ ad Fidem pertinent, nullo casu errare potest. *We conceive he hath sufficiently expressed the sence of the word* Infallibility, *so that,* Infallibilis est, & nullo casu errare potest, *are to us the same thing. It cannot therefore be the Word alone, but the whole importance and sence of that word* Infallibility, *which Mr.* Cressy *so earnestly desires all his Catholicks ever hereafter to forsake, because the former Church did never acknowledge it, and the present Church will never be able to maintaine it. This is the great successe which the Reason, Parts, and Learning of the late Defendors of our Church have had in this maine Architectonicall Controversie.*

And yet though the Church never maintained it, though the Protestants have had such advantage against it, though Mr. Cressy *confessing both, hath wished all Catholicks to forsake it, yet will he not wholly forsake it himself, but undertakes most irrationally to answer for it. If the Church never asserted it, if the* Catholicks be not at all concerned in it, *to what end will Mr.* Cressy *the great mitigator of the rigor, and defendor of the*

latitude

latitude of the Churches Deciſions, maintaine it? If Mr. Chillingworth *have had ſuch good ſucceſſe againſt it, why will his old Friend Mr.* Creſſy *endeavour to anſwer his arguments? eſpecially, conſidering when he hath anſwered them all, he can onely from thence conclude that, Mr.* Chillingworth *was a very bad Diſputant, who could bring no argument able to confute that, which in it ſelfe is not to be maintained.*

So unreaſonable it is and inconſiſtent with his Conceſſions, that he ſhould give an anſwer at all, but the manner of his anſwer, which he gives, is farr more irrationall. For deſerting the Infallibility, *he anſwers onely the authority of the Church, and ſo makes this authority anſwer for that* Infallibility: *from whence theſe three manifeſt abſurdities muſt neceſſarily follow.*

Firſt, When he hath anſwered all M. Chillingworth's *arguments, in the ſame manner as he pretends to anſwer them, he muſt ſtill acknowledge them unanſwerable, as they were intended by him that made them. And no argument need to be thought good for any thing elſe, if he which made it knew what he ſaid, as Mr.* Chillingworth *certainely* did.

Secondly,

Secondly, He onely pretends to answer those arguments, as against the authority of the Church, simply considered without relation to such an Infallibility, which were never made against an authority so quallified. And therefore whether the argument of his deare friend were to any purpose or no, his answer manifestly must be to none.

Thirdly, If hee intend to refute all opposition made to their Infallibility by an assertion of their bare authority, then must he assert that authority to be as great and convincing, which is fallible, as that which is infallible: that Guide to be as good, which may lead me out of my way, as that which cannot. That Iudge to be as fit to determine any doubt, who is capable of a mistake, as he which is not. And then I make no question, but some of his own Church amongst the rest of their dislikes, will put him in mind of that handsome sentence of Cardinall Belarmine, Iniquissimum esset cogere Christianos, ut non appellent ab eo Judicio, quod erroneum esse potuit.

I once thought to have replied to those answers, which he hath given to Mr. Chillingworth's arguments: but his antecedent Concession hath made them so inconsiderable to me, that upon a second

ſecond thought, I feare I ſhould be as guilty in replying after my Objections, as he hath been in anſwering after his Confeſſions. Wherefore I ſhall conclude with an aſſeveration of mine own, which ſhall be therefore ſhort becauſe mine: That the Reply of this moſt excellent Perſon, Sola operarum ſumma præſertim in Græcis incuria excepta, *is the moſt accurate Refutation of all, which can be ſaid in this Controverſie, that ever yet appeared, and if what hath already been delivered have had ſuch ſucceſſe upon ſo eminent an adverſary, then may we very rationally expect at leaſt the ſame effect upon all, who ſhall be ſo happy as to read theſe Diſcourſes.*

Which is the earneſt deſire of

I. P.

THE

OF THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

A discourse written by the Lord Viscount

FALKLAND.

TO him that doubteth whether the Church of *Rome* hath any errors, they answer, that she hath none, for she never can have any; this being so much harder to beleeve then the first, had need be proved by some certainer Arguments, if they expect that the beleefe of this one

ſhould draw on whatſoever they pleaſe to propoſe, yet this, if offered to be proved by no better wayes, then we offer to prove by, that ſhe hath erred; which are arguments from Scripture, and ancient Writers, all which they ſay are fallible, for nothing is not ſo but the Church: Which if it be the onely infallible determination, and that can never be believed upon its owne authority, we can never infallibly know that the Church is infallible, for theſe other waies of proofe may deceive both them and us, and ſo neither ſide is bound to beleeve them; If they ſay that an argument out of Scripture is ſufficient ground of Divine Faith, why are they offended with the Proteſtants for beleeving every part of their Religion upon that ground, upon which they build all theirs at once. And if following the ſame Rule, with equall deſire of finding the Truth by it, (having neither of thoſe qualities which *Iſid. Pelus*, ſaith are the cauſe of all Hereſie, αὐθάδειαν καὶ προπέτειαν, Pride and Prejudication) why ſhould God be more offended with the one, then with the other, though they chance to erre.

They ſay, the Church is therefore made infallible by God, that all men may have ſome certain Guide; yet, though it be infallible, unleſſe it both plainly appeare to be ſo, (for it is not certaine to whom it doth not appeare certaine) and unleſſe it be manifeſt which is the Church, God hath not attained his end; and it were to ſet a ladder to Heaven, and ſeem to have a great care of my going up, whereas unleſſe there be care taken that I may know

know this ladder is here to that purpoſe, it were as good for me it never had been ſet.

If they ſay we may know, for that generall Tradition inſtructs us in it.

I anſwer, that ignorant people cannot know this, and ſo it can be no Rule for them; and if learned people miſtake in this, there can be no condemnation for them.

For ſuppoſe, to know whether the Church of *Rome* may erre, (as a way which will conclude againſt her, but not for her) I ſeek whether ſhe have erred; and conceiving ſhe hath contradicted her ſelf, conclude neceſſarily ſhe hath erred, I ſuppoſe it not damnable, (though falſe) becauſe I try the Church by one of the touch-ſtones which herſelf appoints me (Conformity with the Ancients.) For to ſay, I am to beleeve the preſent Church, that it differs not from the former, though it ſeem to me to do ſo, is to ſend me to a witneſſe, and bid me not beleeve it; now to ſay the Church is provided for a guide of Faith, but muſt be known by ſuch markes as the ignorant cannot ſeek it by, and the learned may chance not find it by, can no way ſatisfie me.

If they ſay God will reveale the Truth to whomſoever ſeeks it theſe waies ſincerely, this ſaying both ſides will (without meanes of being confuted) make uſe of, therefore it would be as good that neither did.

When they have proved the Church to be Infallible, yet to my underſtanding they have proceeded nothing farther, unleſſe we can be ſure

which is it. For it ſignifies onely that God will have a Church alwaies which ſhall not erre, but not that ſuch, or ſuch a ſucceſſion ſhall be in the right, ſo that if they ſay, the *Greek* Church is not the Church, becauſe by its own confeſſion it is not Infallible: I anſwer, That it may be now the Church, and may hereafter erre, (and ſo not be now infallible) and yet the Church never erre, becauſe before their fall from Truth, others may ariſe to maintaine it, who then will be the Church, and ſo the Church may ſtill be infallible, though not in reſpect of any ſet perſons, whom we may know at all times for our Guide.

Then if they prove the Church of *Rome* to be the true Church, and not the *Greek* Church, becauſe their opinions are conſonant either to Scripture or Antiquitie, they run into a Circle, proving their Tenets to be true. Firſt, becauſe the Church holds them: And then theirs to be the Church, becauſe the Church holds the Truth: Which laſt, though it appears to me the onely way, yet it takes away its being a Guide, which we may follow without examination, without which all they ſay beſides, is nothing.

Nay, ſuppoſe that they had evinced, that ſome ſucceſſion were Infallible, and ſo had proved to a learned man, that the *Roman* Chruch muſt be this, becauſe none elſe pretends to it, yet this can be no ſufficient ground to the ignorant, who cannot have any infallible foundation for their beleefe, that the Church of *Greece* pretends not to the ſame; and even to the Learned it is but an accidentall Argument,

gument, becauſe if any other Company had likewiſe claimed to be Infallible, it had overthrown all.

The chiefeſt reaſon why they diſallow of Scripture for Judge, is, becauſe when differences ariſe about the interpretation, there is no way to end them: And that it will not ſtand with the goodneſſe of God, to damne men for not following his Will, if he had aſſigned no infallible way to find it.

I confeſſe this to be wonderfull true, (ὃ γὸ ὅπως πάλας ἔγω ὡς ἕτερα λέγειν παῤ ὀφεσιν) and let them excuſe themſelves that think otherwiſe; yet this will be no Argument againſt him that beleeves, that to them who follow their reaſon in the interpretation of the Scriptures, God will either give his Grace for aſſiſtance to find the Truth, or his pardon if they miſſe it: And then this ſuppoſed neceſſitie of an infallible Guide, (with the ſuppoſed damnation for want of it) fall together to the ground.

If they command us to beleeve infallibly the contrary to this, they are to prove it falſe by ſome infallible way (for the concluſion muſt be of the ſame nature, and not conclude more then the premiſſes ſet down.) Now ſuch a way Scripture, and Reaſon, and infuſed Faith cannot be, (for they uſe to object the fallibility of theſe, to thoſe that build their Religion upon them) nor the authority of the Church, (for this is part of the Queſtion, and muſt it ſelf be firſt proved, and that by none of the former waies, for the former reaſons.) The

The Popes Infallibility can be no infallible ground of Faith, being it ſelf no neceſſary part of Faith, and we can be no ſurer of any thing proved, then we are of that which proves it:) and if he be fallible, no part is the more infallible for his ſiding with them; So if the Church be divided, I have no way to know the true Church, but by ſearching which agrees with Scripture and Antiquitie, and ſo judging accordingly: (but this is not to ſubmit my ſelf to her opinions, as my Guide, which they tell us is neceſſarie) which courſe, if they approve not of as fit for a learned man, they are in a worſe caſe for the ignorant, who can take no courſe at all, nor is he the better at all for his Guide the Church, whilſt two parts diſpute which is it, and that by arguments he underſtands not.

If I grant the Pope, or a Councell by him called, to be infallible, yet I conceive their decrees can be no ſufficient grounds, (by their own axioms) of divine Faith.

For firſt of all, no Councell is valid, not approved by the Pope, (for thus they overthrow that held at *Ariminum*) and a Pope choſen by *Simony*, is (*ipſo facto*) no Pope.

I can have then no certainer grounds for the infallibility of thoſe decrees, and conſequently for my beleefe of them, then I have, that the choice of him is neither directly, nor indirectly *Simoniacall*.

Secondly, ſuppoſe him Pope, and to have confirmed their decrees; yet, that theſe are the decrees

of

of a Councell, or that he hath confirmed them, I can have but an uncontradicted confeſſion of many men; (for if another Councell ſhould declare theſe to have been the Acts of another former Councell, I ſhould need againe ſome certain way of knowing how this declaration is a Councell) which is no ground, ſay they, of Faith, I am ſure not ſo good and generall a one, as we have that the Scripture is Scripture, which yet they will not allow any to be certaine of, but from them.

Thirdly, For the ſence of their decrees, I can have no better expounder then reaſon; which if (though I miſtake) I ſhall not be damned for following, why ſhall I for miſtaking the ſence of the Scripture? or why am I a leſſe fit Interpreter of the one, then of the other? and when both ſeeme equally cleare, and yet contradictory, ſhall not I aſſoon beleeve Scripture which is without doubt of as great authority?

But I doubt whether Councells are fit deciders of Queſtions; for ſuch they cannot be if they beget more, and men are in greater doubts afterwards (none of the former being diminiſhed) then they were at ffirſt.

Now I conceive there ariſe ſo many out of this way, that the learned cannot end all, nor the ignorant know all. As (beſides the fore-named conſiderations) who is to call them? the Pope or Kings? who are to have voices in them, Biſhops onely, or Prieſts alſo? whether the Pope, or Councell be ſuperiour? and the laſt need the approbation

probation of the first (debated amongst themselves?) Whether any Countries, not being called, or not being there, (as the *Abissines*, so great a part of Christianitie, and not resolvedly condemned by them for Hereticks, were absent at the Councell of *Trent*) make it not generall? Whether if it be one not every where received, (as when the Bishops sent from some places have exceeded their Commission, as in the Councell of *Florence*) it be yet of necessitie to be subscribed unto? Whether there were any surreption or force used, and whether those disanull the Acts? Whether the most voices are to be held the Act of the Councell, or those of all required (which never yet agreed?) Or whether two parts will serve, as in the *Tridentine* Synod? A considerable doubt, because *Nicephorus Callistus*, relalating the resolution of a Councell at *Rome*, against that of *Ariminum*, makes him give three reasons.

One, That the Pope of *Rome* was not present.

The Second, That most did not agree to it.

The third, That others thither gathered, were displeased at their resolutions.

Which proves, that (in their opinions) if either most not present, agree not to it, or all present be not pleased with it, a Councell hath no power to bind.

All these doubts I say perswade me, that whatsoever brings with it so many new Questions, can be no fit end of the old.

Then

Then, if before a generall Councell have defined a Question, it be lawfull to hold either way, and damnable to do so after; I desire to know why it is so. Scripture and Tradition seem to me not to say so: but if they did so, I suppose you will grant they do this Doctrine, *That the Soules of the blessed shall see God before the day of Judgement*: (and not be kept in secret Receptacles) for without this, the Doctrine of Prayers to Saints, cannot stand; and yet, for denying this, *Bellarmine* excuseth Pope *John* the 22th. because the Church (he meanes, I doubt not, a generall Councell) had not then condemned it.

I desire to know, why he should not be condemned as well without one, as many Hereticks, that are held so by their Church, yet condemned by none: (which if he make to be the Rule of Heresie, it had been happy to have lived before the Councell of *Nice*, when no opinion had been damnable, but some against the Apostles Councell at *Hierusalem*, because there had yet been no other generall Councell,) at least, why should not I be excused by the same reason, though I beleeve not a Councell to be infallible: since I never heard that any Councell hath decreed that they are so, neither if it hath, can we be bound by that decree, unlesse first made certaine some other way, that it selfe is so.

If you say, we must beleeve it because of Tradition, I answer, Sometimes you will have the not beleeving any thing not declared by a Councell, to have power enough to damne (that is when

againſt any of us :) at other times the Church hath not decreed unleſſe a Councell have, and their error is pardonable, and they good Catholicks.

Next, (as I have asked before) how ſhall an ignorant man know it ? For he in likelihood can ſpeak but with a few, from whom he cannot know, that all of the Church of *Romes* part do now, and in paſt ages have beleeved it to be Tradition, ſo certaine as to make it a ground of Faith, (unleſſe he have ſome revelation that thoſe deceived him not) neither indeed can thoſe that ſhould inform him of the opinions of former times be certainely informed themſelves : For truely, if the relation of *Pappias* could cozen ſo far all the prime Doctors of the Chriſtian Church into a beleefe of the celebration of a thouſand yeeres after the reſurrection, ſo as that no one of thoſe two firſt ages oppoſe it, (which appeares plainly enough, becauſe thoſe that after riſe up againſt this, never quoated any thing for themſelves before *Dionyſius Alexandrinus*, who lived at leaſt two hundred and fifty yeares after Chriſt;) nay, if thoſe firſt men did not onely beleeve it as probable, but *Juſtine Martir* ſaith, he holds it, and ſo do all that are in all parts Orthodox Chriſtians, ἐγὼ καὶ εἰ τινες εἰσιν κατὰ πάντα ὀρθογνώμονες χριστιανοί. *Irenæus* ſets it down directly for a Tradition, and relates the very words that Chriſt uſed, when he taught this, which is plainner then any other Tradition, is proved or ſaid to be out of antiquity by them) if I ſay theſe could be ſo deceived, why might not other of the ancients

ancients as well be deceived in other points, and then what certaintie shall the learned have (when after much labour, they think they can make it appeare, that the ancients thought any thing Tradition) that indeed it was so, and that either the folly or the knavery of some *Pappias* deceived them not? I confesse it makes me think of some that *Tully* speakes of, who *arcem amittunt, dum propugnacula defendunt*, loose the Fort, whilst they defend the out-works; For whilst they answer this way the Arguments of Tradition for the opinions of the *Chiliasts*, they make unusefull to themselves the force of Tradition, to prove any else by.

For which cause it was rather wisely then honestly done of them, who (before *Fevardentius* set him forth) left out that part of *Irenæus* which we alleadge, (though we need it not much; for many of the Fathers take notice of this beleef of his) yet he justifies himself for doing it, by saying, that if they leave out all errors in the books they publish, (that is, I suppose, all opinions contrary to the Church of *Rome*) *bona pars scriptorum, Patrum Orthodoxorum evaneseceret*, a great part of the writings of the Orthodox Fathers must vanish away.

But the Tradition that can be found out of Ancients (since their witnessing may deceive us) hath much lesse strength, when they argue onely thus, sure so many would not say this is true, if there were no Tradition for them,

I would have you remember, they can deliver

their opinions possibly, but either before the controversie arise in the Church, (upon some chance) or after; If before, it is confessed that they writ not often cautiously enough, and so they answer all they seem to say for *Arrius*, and *Pelagius* his Faith, before themselves, and so consequently, their controversie (though it may be not their opinion) arose.

If after, Then they answer often, (if any thing be by them at that time spoken against them) that the heat of disputation brought it from them, and their resolution to oppose hereticks enough; I desire, it may be lawfull for us to answer so too, (either one of these former waies, or that it was (as often they say too) some Hyperbole) when they presse us with the opinions of Fathers.

At least I am sure, if they may deceive us with saying a thing is Tradition, when it is not, we may be sooner deceived if we will conclude it for a Tradition, when they speak it onely as a Truth, and (for ought appeares) their particular opinion.

Besides, If *Salvian* comparing the *Arrians* with evill livers, (and that after they were condemned by a Councell) extenuates (by reason of their beleeving themselves in the right) with much instance, the fault of the *Arrians*, and saith, how they shall be punished in the day of Judgement, none can know but the Judge.

If I say, They confesse it to be his opinion, they must also confesse the Doctrine of the Church to differ from that of *Salvians* time, because he

was

was allowed a member of that, for all this saying, whereas he of the Church of *Rome*, that should now say so of us, would be counted *sesqui-hæreticus*, a Heretick and halfe, or else they must say (which they can onely say, and not prove) that he was so earnest against ill men, that for the aggravation of their crime, he lessened that of the Hereticks, and said, what at another time he would not have said; which if they do, will it not overthrow wholly the authority of the Fathers? Since we can never infallibly know, what they thought at all times, from what they were moved to say at some one time, by some Collaterical considerations.

Next, To this certaine and undoubted damning of all out of the Church of *Rome*, which averteth me from it, comes their putting all to death that are so, where they have power (which is an effect, though not a necessary one of the first opinion) and that averteth me yet more, for I do not beleeve all to be damned that they damne, but I conceive all to be killed that they kill; I am sure if you look upon *Constantines* Epistle, written to perswade concord upon their first disagreement between *Alexander*, and *Arrius*, you will find, that he thought, (and if the Bishops about him had then thought otherwise, he would have been sure better informed) that neither side deserved either death, or damnation, (and yet sure you will say, this Question was as great as ever rose since) for having spoken of the opinions, as things so indifferent, that the Reader might almost think

that

that they had been fallen out at ſpurn-point, or kittle-pins, he adds, τὸ γὰρ ἀναγκαῖον ἓν εἶναι περὶ τῆς θείας προνοίας συμφωνεῖν πάντας, καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν τερεῖν πίστιν, for that which is neceſſary is one thing, that all agree, and keep the ſame Faith, about divine Providence. I am ſure, in the ſame Author, *Moſes* (a man praiſed by him) refuſing to be made Biſhop by *Lucius*, becauſe he was an *Arrian*, and he anſwering that he did ill to refuſe it, becauſe he knew not what his Faith was, anſwered, τὴν σὴν πίστιν δείκνυσιν ἡ τῶν ἐπισκόπων ὑπερορία. The baniſhing of Biſhops ſhew enough thy Faith. So that it is plaine, that he thought puniſhing for opinions to be a mark, which might ſerve to know falſe opinions by. And I beleeve throughout Antiquitie, you will find no putting any to death, unleſſe it be ſuch as begin to kill firſt, as the *Circumcellians*, or ſuch like: I am ſure Chriſtian Religions chiefeſt glory being, that it encreaſeth by being perſecuted; and having that advantage of the *Mahumetan*, which came in by force, me thinks (eſpecially ſince *Syneſius* had told us, and Reaſon told men ſo before *Syneſius*, that τοῖς ἐναντίοις τῶν συνιστάντων ἕκαστον φθείρεται; Every thing is deſtroyed by the contrary to what ſetled and compoſed it;) It ſhould be to take ill care of Chriſtianity, to hold it up by Turkiſh meanes, at leaſt it muſt breed doubts, that if the Religion had alwaies remained the ſame, it would not be now defended by waies ſo contrary to thoſe, by which at firſt it was propagated.

I deſire recrimination may not be uſed; for though it be true, that *Calvin* had done it, and the

the Church of *England*, a little (which is a little too much) for *negare manifesta non audeo, & excusare immodica non possum*, yet she (confessing she may erre) is not so chargeable with any fault, as those which pretend they cannot, and so will be sure never to mend it; and besides I will be bound to defend no more then I have undertaken, which is to give reason why the Church of *Rome* is infallible.

I confess this opinion of damning so many, and this custome of burning so many, this breeding up those, who knew nothing else in any point of Religion, yet to be in a readinesse to cry, *To the fire with him, to Hell with him*, (as *Polybius* saith in a certaine furious faction of an army of severall nations, and consequently of severall languages, μόνον τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο κοινῆ συνείσαν, [τὸ βάλλε] They all joyned onely in understanding this word, [*throw at him.*] These I say, in my opinion were chiefly the causes which made so many, so suddenly leave the Church of *Rome*, that indeed to borrow the same Authors Phrase, οὐ παρακλήσεως πρὸς τὴν ἀπόστασιν ἀλλ' ἀγγέλλου μόνον ἐδεήθησαν: They needed no perswasion to do it, but onely newes that others had done it: For as this alone if beleeved, makes all the rest to be so too, so one thing alone disliked, (where infallibility is claimed) overthrowes all the rest.

If it were granted, that it agreeth not with the goodnesse of God, to let men want an infallible Guide, and therefore there must be one, and that the Church of *Rome* were it, yet if that teach any thing to my understanding contrary to Gods good-

goodneſſe, I am not to receive her Doctrine, for the ſame cauſe for which they would have me receive it, (it being as good an argument this guide teacheth things contrary to Gods goodneſſe, therefore this is not appointed by God, as to ſay, it is agreeable to his goodneſſe there ſhould be one, therefore there is one) and ſure it is lawfull to examine particular Doctrines, whether they agree with that Principle, which is their foundation; and for that (me thinks) to damn him, that neither with negligence, nor prejudication, ſearches what is Gods will, (though he miſſe of it) is as contrary, as the firſt can be ſuppoſed.

Next, I would know, whether he, that hath never heard of the Church of *Rome*, ſhall yet be damned for not beleeving her infallible?

I have ſo good an opinion of them, as to aſſure my ſelf, they will anſwer he ſhall not.

I will then ask, whether he that hath ſearched what Religions there are, and finds hers to be one, and her infallibility to be a part of it, (if his reaſon will not aſſent to that) ſhall be damned for being inquiſitive after Truth, (for he hath committed no other fault, greater then the other) and whether ſuch an ignorance, (I mean after impartiall ſearch) be not of all other the moſt invincible?

Nay, grant the Church to be infallible, yet me thinks, he that denies it, and imploies his reaſon to ſeek, if it be true, ſhould be in as good caſe, as he that beleeveth it, and ſearcheth not at all the truth of the Propoſition he receives; For I cannot ſee why

why he ſhould be ſaved, becauſe by reaſon of his parents beleef, or the Religion of the Country, or ſome ſuch accident, the Truth was offered to his underſtanding, when, had the contrary been offered, he would have received that. And the other damned, that beleeves falſhood upon as good ground, as the other doth truth, unleſſe the Church be like a Conjurers Circle, that will keep a man from the Divell, though he came unto it by chance.

They grant no man is an Heretick, that beleeves not his Hereſie obſtinately, and if he be no Heretick, he may ſure be ſaved; It is not then certain damnation for any man to deny the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*, but for him onely that denies it obſtinately; And then I am ſafe, for I am ſure I do not; Neither can they ſay, I ſhall be damned for Schiſme, though not for Hereſie, for he is as well no Shciſmatick, though in Schiſme, that is willing to joyne in Communion with the true Church, when it appears to be ſo to him, as he is no Heretick, though he holds Hereticall opinions, who holds them not obſtinately, that is (as I ſuppoſe) with a deſire to be informed if he be in the wrong.

Next, Why if it be not neceſſary alwaies to beleeve the Truth, ſo one beleeve in generall what the Church would have beleeved, (for ſo they excuſe great men that have held contrary opinions to theirs now, before they were defined, or knew them to be ſo) why I ſay, ſhall not the ſame implicite aſſent ſerve to whatſoever God would

have assented unto? (though I mistake what that is:) when indeed to beleeve implicitely what God would have beleeved, is to beleeve implicitely likewise what the Church teacheth, if this Doctrine be within the number of those, which God commands to be beleeved.

I have the lesse doubt of this opinion, that I shall have no harme for not beleeving the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*, because of my being so farr from leaning to the contrary, and so suffering my will to have power over my understanding, that if God would leave it to me, which Tenet should be true, I would rather chuse, that that should, then the contrary.

For they may well beleeve me, that I take no pleasure in tumbling hard and unpleasant Books, and making my self giddy with disputing obscure Questions, ὥσπερ οἱ ἐκ τινὸς ὑψηλῆς ἀκρωχείας εἰς ἀχανὲς κατακόπτοντες πέλαγος. If I should beleeve, there should alwaies be, whom I might alwaies know, a society of men, whose opinions must be certainely true, and who would ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁπάντων ἀσκολεῖσθαι σκολῆς, labour to discusse and define all arising doubts, so that I might be excusably at ease, and have no part left for me but that of obedience, which must needs be a lesse difficult, and so a more agreeable way, then to endure endlesse Volumes of Commenters, the harsh *Greek* of *Epiphanius*, and the harder *Latin* of *Irenæus*, and be pained by distinguishing between different sences, and various Lections, and he would deserve not the lowest place in *Bedlem*, that would preferr these studies before so many,

ny, so more pleasant; that would rather imploy his understanding then submit it, and if he could think God imposed upon him onely the resisting temptations, would by way of addition require from himself, the resolving of doubts; yet I say not, that all these Books are to be read by those that understand not the languages, (for them I conceive their seeking into the Scripture may suffice) but he who hath by Gods grace skill to look into them, cannot better use it then in the searching of his will, where they say it is to be found, that he may assent to them, if there he find reason for it, or if not, they may have no excuse for not excusing him.

For whereas they say it is pride makes us doubt of their Infallibilitie.

I answer, That their too much lazinesse and impatience of examining is the cause, that many of them do not doubt.

Next, what pride is it never to assent, before I find reason (since they, when they follow their Church as infallible, pretend reason for it, and will not say they would, if they thought they found none) and if they say, we do find reason, but will not confesse it; then pride hinders not our assent, but our declaration of it, which if it do in any one, he is without question αὐτοκατάκριτος, condemned by himself, and it must be a very partiall Advocate, that would strive to acquit him.

One much prevailing argument, which they make, is this, That whosoever leaves them, fall into dissention between themselves, whereas

they in the mean while are allwaies at Unity.

I anſwer,

Firſt, In this whereof the Queſtion is now, they all aſſent.

Secondly, When there is fire for them that diſagree, they need not bragg of their Uniformity who conſent.

Thirdly, they have many differences among them, as whether the Pope be Infallible? whether God predeterminate every action? whether Election and Reprobation depend upon fore-ſight? Which ſeemes to me as great as any between their Adverſaries, and in the latter, the Jeſuites have ancienter, and generaller Tradition on their ſide, then the Church of *Rome* hath in any other Queſtion, and as much ground from Reaſon for the defence of Gods goodneſſe, as they can think they have for the neceſſity of an infallible guide.

Yet theſe arguments muſt not make the *Dominicans* Hereticks, and muſt us: If they ſay the Church hath not reſolved it, (which ſignifies onely that they are not agreed about it, which is that we object) I anſwer, It ought to have done ſo, if uniformity to the Ancient Church be required, in which all that ever I could heare of, before Saint *Auſtine* (who is ever various I confeſſe in it) delivered the contrary to the *Dominicans* as not doubtfull; and to ſay it is lawfull for them to diſagree, whereſoever they do not agree, is ridiculous, (for they cannot do both at once about the ſame point) and if they ſay they mean by the Churches not having concluded it, that a Councell

cell hath not: I Anſwer,

Firſt, That they condemne ſome without any Councell, and why not theſe?

Next, I ſay the opinion of the diffuſed Church is of more force, then the concluſion of the repreſentative (which hath its authority from the other) and therefore if all extant for the firſt four hundered yeares taught any thing, it is more Hereſie to deny that, then any Cannon of a Councell; But may not howſoever any other Company of People (that would maintaine themſelves to be infallible) ſay as much, that all other Sects differ from one another, and therefore ſhould all agree with them, would not thoſe (think they) aſcribe all other mens diſſentions, and learned mens falling into diverſe hereſies to their not allowing their Infallibility, to their not aſſenting to their Decrees, and not ſuffering them διδασκάλους τῆς ζητουμένων καθέδρας, τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους ἐν μαθητῶν μέρει τασσόντας ἔχειν, to ſit as teachers of thoſe things that come in Queſtion, and to have all others in the place of Diſciples obedient to them, which is that which *Nilus* a *Greek* Biſhop profeſſed, that (becauſe the *Greeks* would not allow the *Romans*) was the chief cauſe of ſeparation between them.

Next, They uſe much to object, how could errors come into the Church without oppoſition, and mention both of them, and the oppoſition to them in Hiſtory.

I anſwer,

They might come not at once, but by degrees, as in the growth of a Child, or motion of a Clock, we

we see neither in the present, but know there was a present when we find it past.

Next, I say there are two sorts of errors; To hold a thing necessary that is unlawfull, and false; or that is but profitable, and probable. Of the second sort, that errors should come in, it appears not hard to me, (especially in those ages where want of Printing, made Books, and consequently Learning, not so common as now it is, where the few that did study, busied themselves in Schoole speculations onely, when the authority of a man of chief note, had a more generall influence then now it hath, and so as *Thucidides* saith the Plague did in his time, διέβαινε διὰ παντὸς σώματος τὸ ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ ἱδρυθὲν κακὸν, the disease that first seized in the head EASILY passed through all the body, considering how apt men are to desire that all men should think as they do, and consequently to lay a necessity upon the receiving that opinion, if they conceive that a way to have it received. And then if it were beleeved generally, profitable (as confession) who would be apt to oppose their calling it necessary, for the same cause for which they called it so.

Besides, If this error were delivered by some Father in the hot opposition of some Heretick, it may be none would oppose it, least the adversaries might take advantage by their dissention, and he that disputed for the Orthodox side, might lose by it much of his authority.

The word *necessary* it self, is also often used for very convenient, and then from necessary in that

sence

ſence, to abſolutely neceſſary is no difficult change, though it be a great one.

Then the Fathers uſe the word Hereticks, ſometimes in a larger ſence, and ſometimes in a ſtricter, and ſo differ in the reekoning them up, ſome leaving out thoſe that others put in, (though they had ſeen the precedent Catalogue) and ſo the doubtfullneſſe of the ſence of theſe words might bring in error: Names alſo, as *Altar*, *Sacrifice*, *Maſſe*, may have been uſed.

Firſt, in one ſence, and the name retained though the thing ſignified received change; as it was once of an Emperour of *Rome*, *cui proprium fuit nuper reperta*, (I leave out *ſcelera*) *priſcis verbis obtegere*, whoſe property it was to cover things newly found with ancient termes. *Tacitus.* And the ſame Author tells us, that the ſame ſtate, was as it were, cheated out of her liberty, becauſe there did remaine *eadem Magiſtratuum vocabula*, the ſame titles of Magiſtrates: And I beleeve, that if the Proteſtants beyond the Seas would have thought Biſhops as good a word as *Super-intendents*, (and ſo in other ſuch things) many, who underſtand nothing but names, would have miſſed the ſcandale they have now taken. Theſe waies I think theſe things may have come, without much oppoſition from being thought profitable to be done, and probable to be beleeved, to be thought neceſſary to be both, and how things may have been by little and little received under old names, which would not have been ſo at once under new ones, it is not hard to conceive.

The

The first of these being no such small fault, but that part of the Montanists Heresies was, thinking uncommanded fasting daies necessary to be observed, which without doubt might lawfully have been kept, so that no necessitie had been imposed.

But my maine answer is, that if to be in the Church without known precedent opposition, be a certaine note of being derived from the begining, let them answer how came in the opinion of the *Chiliasts*, not contradicted till two hundred yeares after it came in.

To conclude, If they can prove that the Scripture may be a certainer teacher of truth to them, then to us, so that they may conclude the Infallibility of the Church out of it, and we nothing; If they can prove the Churches Infallibility to be a sufficient Guide for him, that doubts which is the Church, and cannot examine that (for want of learning) by her chiefe marke, which is conformity with the Ancients: If they can prove, that the consent of Fathers long together, is a stronger Argument against us, then against the *Dominicans*; If they can prove (though it be affirmed by the first of them, that such a thing is Tradition, and beleeved by all Christians, and this assertion till a great while after, uncontradicted) yet they are not bound to receive it, and upon lesse grounds we are; If indeed any can prove by any infallible way, the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*, and the necessity under paine of damnation for all men to beleeve it, (which were the more strange,

because

becauſe *Juſtin Martyr*, and *Clements Alexandrinus* among the Ancients, and *Eraſmus*, and *Ludovicus Vives* among the Modernes, beleeve ſome *Pagans* to be ſaved) I will ſubſcribe to it, and

Ὅστις ἔννους τῇδε τῇ πόλει θανὼν,
καὶ ζῶν ὁμοίως ἐξ ἐμοῦ τιμήσεται.

If any man vouchſafe to think, either this, or the Authour of it, of value enough to confute the one, and informe the other, I ſhall deſire him to do it with proceeding to the buſineſſe, and not ſtanding upon any ſmall ſlip of mine, (of which this may be full) and with that temper, which is fit to be uſed by men that are not ſo paſſionate, as to have the definition of reaſonable Creatures in vaine, remembring that Truth in likelyhood is, where her Author God was, in the *ſtill voice*, and not the *loud wind*; and that *Epiphanius* excuſeth himſelf, if he have called any Hereticks in his anger, Deceivers, or Wretches, (εἰ παροξυνόμενος τὶ λέγοι ἀπατηῶνας καλῶν ἢ ἀθλίους.) and I requeſt him alſo; to help to bring me to the Truth, (if I be out of it) not onely by his arguments, but alſo by his Prayers; which way if he uſe, and I ſtill continue on the part I am of, and yet doe neither ἕκων τυφλωτεῖν, nor ὁρῶν ἀναισχυντεῖν, neither am willfully blind, nor deny impudently, what I ſee, then I am confident, that he will neither have reaſon to be offended with me in this world, nor God (for that) to puniſh me in the next.

AN ANSVVER TO THE Lord FAVLKLANDS DISCOURSE OF INFALLIBILITY.

CHAP. I.

NAture being not able to perfect the work of humane kind, which ſhee had begun, and burſting at thoſe throwes and ſpringings, which her timely child gave, to ſee the light of eternall life, (whereof the diſtaſte of all things experienced in this world, and certain ſparklings ſowed in our ſoule had given it a dim notice) expected from her mercifull

Creator, the aid (whereof how much greater the wonder was to bee, and the neceſſity, now divers thouſand yeers by lamentable experience was more deer, ſo much the readier was he) and it was to ſend from his eternall breſt, his only wiſedome to recount us wonders, and averre them under the ſeal of his immutable truth. He knew all ſecrets, and could not be touched with ſuſpition of ignorance; he was all goodneſs, and free from all calumnie of jealouſie or envie: who knew him, could not miſtruſt him, for beſide thoſe great Verdicts alreadie expreſſed in his favour, his works gave aſſurance of his words, he fulfilling in deeds, whatſoever he perſwaded in words, and working to himſelf, what he wiſhed unto others. Lo here, the high, and ſage Maſter of our faith, whoſe Oracles we cannot miſ-doubt, ſo we be aſſured they are his; and who hath in vain ſpent ſo much ſweat, and pains, if after he paſſed from hence, he hath left no meanes to aſſure mankind, what it was hee taught and practiſed, and for the teaching and practiſing of it, eſchewed not the ſtormie paſſage betwixt *Bethlehem* and *Mount Calvarie*: but as in *Bethlehem* he multiplied the three drops of his Circumciſion into the thouſands of innocent Brooks; ſo upon the Mount *Calvarie* he opened the great Source, which hath now through 16. Ages irrigated the world with an infinitie of ſtreames of proportionall examples of blood and ſufferance. Now was his Legacie performed, and hee from Mount *Oliver* triumphantly returned, from whence he was come, and the world left to be ſaved by faith,

faith, that is, by a constant perswasion of those things which he had taught.

The Conditions of this Faith were three. First, That it should be a means fitting for humane kind, that is, for learned, and unlearned, for yong, and old, for wise, and fooles, for Princes and peasants, Rabbies, and Ideots. Secondly, That it should be a tenent, constant, undoubted, undisputable, uncontroulable. Thirdly, That it should be a rule of our life and actions, making but a passage of this present life, to the following, and teaching us to contemn the present and seen substance, in hope of an unseen and absent fortune. *Certes*, a hard taske, and which needeth to be well grounded and founded by God himself. For who well considereth it, cannot doubt it, to be as great a miracle (to make the whole Masse of mankinde, to forsake what it feeth, and take to obscure hopes or things, it does not so much apprehend what they are) as to force the strongest works of nature, to hang the sea in the aire, to alter the course of Moon, and Starres, and whatsoever else is strange and incredible in nature. Besides that, to make a way of knowledge common, and indifferent to learned, and unlearned, to make the ignorant understand, what the learned cannot reach unto, and the learned die in defence of the truth he hath no other warrant for, then because he hath learned it from an ignorant person, was the work of him alone who framed them both, and understood in what veins so different blouds doe run.

But done it was to be, and how? Those to whom

during his life, he had most fully declared his mind, went, and told it to others, and all was done. We cannot denie the way to have been fitting, and expedient, so it be found efficacious and powerfull to effect, what the Author intended. For if Faith must beleeve what Christ hath taught, what better instrument to breed faith, then who heard him speak? If Faith must be common to learned, and unlearned, what better meanes, then by hearing? From which no unlearnednesse can excuse, nor learnednesse be exempt. Every man may have from whom to hear and learn, if not a wiser then himselfe, yet one who may have properties to be a better witnesse. Children naturally beleeve what their parents tell them, unlearned men what Doctors teach them, absent men, what those who were present doe report. All this goeth very well, so that this Expedient prove efficacious to the end intended.

Object. *But it hath the prejudice of humane fallibilitie, for who, for weaknesse that he doth not carry away what he hath heard, who, for vanity to seem to know more then his fellowes, who, to make some lucre of it, or for some emulation to some other; but seldome it hapneth that a multitude can carry away a thing all in the same manner; and 1600 yeers are passed since, so that it is not credible, a Doctrine so delivered can persever incorrupted untill this day.*

Answ. Yet if we look into the immediate progresse and joints of the descent, we cannot finde where it can misse, for the doctrine being supernaturall, and not delivered by mans skill or wit, the first and main

principle

principle of it can be no other, then to know what was delivered them by their Teachers, a thing not surpassing the understanding of any sensible wise man; so that put but twenty wise understanding men to agree, that the Preacher, to their certaine knowledge, said such a thing, there remaineth no probable nor possible doubt, but that it was so.

Now then suppose, that one of those (who having been taught by Christs own mouth, had received by the confirmation of the Holy Ghost, that he could neither forget nor forgoe this received doctrine) should have preached over and over again the same doctrine not long, nor hard to be carryed away in all the Cities, Towns, and Boroughs of some great Country, so that whilst he stayd there, they were throughly understanding and endoctrinated in that way. Now let him be gone, and after him all dead, who had heard him speake; and then some question arise concerning this doctrine (as we may say in the second age) let us see whether error can creep in or no, if the Christians keepe unto their hold. Their hold is what they were taught by Christs Apostles. Let therefore the wisest and best men of those Cities and Towns meet together about the controversie, and discusse it out of this principle (what was delivered unto them as taught by the Apostles) will not there be a quick end of their dispute? For every man can say, My father heard the Apostle speak, he understood him to have said this, so he himselfe believed, so he taught me, that this was that which the Apostle taught us. And when

out of divers Cities and Towns, shall come a multitude of witnesses, all agreeing in one point, how can it be doubted, but that this is Christs doctrine, and that which his Apostle taught? And to disagree how is it possible? Since all their fathers heard the same things, and things not above their capacity, and often told them, and well apprehended by them when they were taught, and by consequence could not tell their children otherwise then what they had heard and understood, in a matter of such moment, and of which they apprehended no lesse, then that it concerned their own, and their childrens salvation, happinesse, or misery for all eternity. And what here is most evidently certaine, in the children of those who heard the Apostles, may be derived with as much evidence again in the grand-children, and so in every age even to our present; for if in any age any question beginne, and it be reduced unto this principle; what did our forefathers teach us? neither can there be any pretended ignorance (for who can be ignorant of what was taught him when he was a childe, and in what he was bred, as in the grounds and substance of his hopes, for all eternity?) True it is, that if men leave this principle, and seek to judge the controversie by learned discourse, then may the Church be divided, one part following the authority of their Ancestors; the other the subtle Arguments, and the great opinion they conceive, of the learning of their present Teachers: so that one side will claime succession, and to have received it from hand to hand; the other the glory

of

of great learning, and to have come by great industry to discover the errors of their forefathers. But it is evident, that if what the Apostles preached be the touchstone of what is true, and what they preached to be seen in what those beleeve who have heard them, and they who received it from them that heard them; It is most evident, I say, that the one part, who seek for Christian truth in learned discourse, must needs forgoe the most certain and easie way, of attaining unto what they aime at: And likewise evident, that who keep themselves duly and carefully unto this principle cannot possibly in any continuance of time, swerve from the truth which Christ hath left unto his Church. So that the whole difficulty is reduced unto this, whether the Church for so many ages be perpetually preserved in this principle, that what she received from her forefathers is, that she must beleive, and deliver unto her posterity; A thing so grafted in nature, which maketh us receive our being, our breeding, our learning, our goods, our estates, our arts, and all things we have, from our fathers, that it is a wonder of our mutability, that without forcible Engines we can be drawn from it.

CHAP.

Chap. II.

NOw let us turn our diſcourſe, and as we have ſeen, that if our Saviour ordred his Apoſtles in the manner explicated, there was no way for his Church to ſwerve from his truth, but by ſwerving from the moſt plain, the moſt naturall, and moſt evident, and concluding rule of his doctrine, and that but one, and moſt eaſie; ſo let us ſee whether from the preſent Church we can draw the like forcible train, which may lead us up to Chriſt and his Apoſtles. Be therefore ſuppoſed or imagined, what no judicious man can deny to ſee with his eyes, if he hath never ſo little caſt them upon this preſent religion of Chriſtendome, to wit, that there is one Congregation or Church which layeth claime to Chriſt his doctrine, as upon this title, that ſhe hath received it from his Apoſtles without interruption, delivered ever from Father to Sonne, from Maſter to Scholler, from time to time, from hand to hand, even unto this day; and that ſhe does not admit any other doctrine for good and legitimate, which ſhe does not receive in this manner. Againe, that whoſoever pretendeth Chriſt his truth againſt her, ſaith, that true it is, that once ſhe had the true way, but that by length of time ſhe is fallen into groſſe errours which they will reforme, not by any truth they have received from hand to hand, from thoſe who by both parts are acknowledged to have received their leſſon from Chriſt

Christ and his Apostles, but by study and learned Arguments, either out of ancient Writers, or out of the secrets of nature and reason. This being supposed, either this principle hath remained unto her since the beginning, or she took it up in some one age of the 16 she hath endured; if she took it up in some latter age, she then thought she had nothing in her what she had not received from her fore fathers in this sort: And if she thought so, she knew it. For as it is impossible now any country should think it was generally taught, such a thing if it were not so; so also was there the like necessity, and impossibility to be otherwise, if all men were not runne mad. Therefore clear it is, she took it not up first then, but was in former possession, and so clear it is, that she could not have it now, if she had it not from the very beginning. Now if she had it, and hath conserved it from the beginning, no new opinion could take root in her, unlesse it came unto her under this Maxime, as received from hand, to hand; and to say, that any opinion which was not truly received from hand to hand, should by such a community be accepted, as received from hand to hand, is to make it beleeve, what it seeth clearly to be false, to lye unto it's own soule, against it's own soule, and the soule of it's posterity. Let us adde to this, that the multitude of this Church is so dispersed through so many Countries and languages of so divers governments, that it is totally impossible they should agree together, or meet upon a false determination, to affirme with one consent a falsity for truth, no interest being able to

be common unto them all to produce such an effect. Wherefore as an understanding man cannot chuse but laugh at the self-weening *Hampshire* Clown, who thinks in his heart there was no such Country as *France*, and that all that was told of it were but Travellers tales, because himselfe being upon the Sea shore, had seen nothing but water beyond *England*; so I think no wise man will accompt him lesse then phrentick, that understandeth so little in humane wayes, as to think whole Nations by designe, or by hazard, can agree together to professe, and protest a thing, which they know of their own knowledge to be a meer lye, and a well known falshood to themselves, and all their neighbours.

Chap. III.

THe force of the declared linke of succession, is so manifest to a capable understanding, that being compared with any objection made against it, it will of it selfe maintain it's evidence, and bear down the greatest oppositors and opposition, if the understanding be left unto it selfe, and not wrested by the prejudice of a some wayes interessed will. Nevertheless, there is a deeper root, which greatly strengthens and reduceth into action, the former efficacity of the tradition. And this is, that Christian doctrine is not a speculative knowledge, instituted for delight of man to entertain his understanding, and hath no further end then the delectation which ariseth out of contemplation; but

it

it is an art of living, a rule of attaining unto eternall bliſſe, a practicall doctrine whoſe end is to informe our action, that our life and actions ſquared by her directions, may lead us to that great good, the which God Almighty eſteemed ſo highly of; that he thought it reaſon enough for him to ſhade his Divinity under the miſery of man, to make us partakers of ſo great a bliſſe. Hence it followeth, that no error can fall, even in a point which ſeemeth wholly ſpeculative in Chriſtian faith, but ſoone it breedeth a practicall effect, or rather defection in Chriſtian behaviour. What could ſeem more ſpeculative, then whether the ſecond, or third Perſons of the Trinity were truly or participately God? Yet no ſooner was an error broached in theſe queſtions, but there followed a great alteration in Chriſtian action; in their Baptiſmes, in their manner of Prayer, in the motives of Love and Charity toward Almighty God, the very ground-work and foundation of all Chriſtian life. Whether man hath free-will or no, ſeemeth a queſtion, belonging to the nature of man, fit for a curious Phyloſopher; but upon the preaching of the negative part, preſently followed an unknowen Libertinage, men yeilding themſelves over to all concupiſcence, ſince they were perſwaded they had no power to reſiſt, free-will being denyed. I need not inſtance in prayer to Saints, worſhiping Images, prayer for the dead, and the like; which is evident, could not be changed without an apparent change in Chriſtian Churches. So that a doctrine contrary to faith, is like a diſeaſe,

which although the cauſe be internall, yet cannot the effects and ſymptomes be kept from the outward parts and view of the world. The conſequence which this note draweth, is, that it is not poſſible, that any materiall point of Chriſtian faith can be changed, as it were by obreption, whilſt men are on ſleepe, but it muſt needs raiſe a great ſcandall and tumult in the Chriſtian Common-weale. For ſuppoſe the Apoſtles had taught the world it were Idolatry to pray to Saints, or uſe reverence towards their Pictures: How can we imagine this honour brought in, without a vehement conflict and tumult, in a people which did ſo greatly abhor Idolatry, as the Apoſtles, Diſciples did? I might make the like inſtance in other points, if the whole Hiſtory of the Church did not conſiſt of the invaſions made by Heretiques, and the great and moſt violent waving of the Church to and fro upon thoſe occaſions. We remember in a manner as yet, how change came into *Germany*, *France*, *Scotland*, and our own Country: Let thoſe be a ſigne to us, what we may thinke can be the creeping in of falſe doctrine; ſpecially, that there is no point of doctrine, contrary to the Catholique Church, rooted in any Chriſtian Nation, that the Eccleſiaſticall Hiſtory does not mention the times and combats by which it entred, and tore the Church in peices.

Let it therefore remaine for moſt evidently conſtant, that into the Chriſtian Church can come no error, but it muſt be ſeen and noted, and raiſe ſcandall and oppoſition to ſhew it ſelfe (as truly it

is) contrary to the nature of Piety and Religion. And when it does come, it cannot draw after it any others, then such as first desert the root of Faith, and Anchor of Salvation, that is to be judged by what their fore-fathers taught them, and affirmed to have received from their Ancestors, as the Faith which Christ and his Apostles delivered to the whole world of their time, and to such as ever claime and maintaine the right of succession, as rule of what they beleeve. Yet may this also be worthy of consideration, that as in our naturall body, the principall parts are defended by Bones, Flesh, Skinnes, and such like defences, in such sort, that no outward Agent can come to offend them, before having annoyed some of these; so in the Catholique faith, there are in speculation those we call Theologicall conclusions, and other pious opinions; and in practise many Rites and Ceremonies, which stop the passage unto the maine principall parts of Christian beleife and action. And about these we see daily such great motions in the Catholique Church, that he must be very ignorant of the Spirit of God, which quickneth his Church, that can imagine any vitall part of his faith can be wounded while it lyes asleep, and is insensible of the harm befalleth it; for as in any Science a principle cannot be mistaken, but it must needs draw a great shoale of false consequence upon it, and lame the whole Science, so never so little an error in faith can be admitted, but in other Tenets and Ceremonies it must needs make a great change, and innovation.

Chap. IV.

NOw let any discreet man consider, what further evidence he can desire, or peradventure, what greater assurance nature can afford, and not be of an awkward wilfulnesse to aske, that which is not conformable to the lawes of nature? Much like unto him, who being sate in a chaire far from the chimney, could not think of applying himselfe to the fire, but was angry the fire and chimney were made so far from him. The Phylosophers say, it is *indisciplinati ingenii* to expect in any Art or Science more exactnesse then the nature of it affordeth. As if a man would bind a Seaman, to goe so far every day, whether wind and weather served or no: So in morall matters, and such as are subject to humane action, we must expect such assurance as humane actions beare. If for the government of your spirituall life, you have as much as for the managing of your naturall and civill life, what can you expect more? Two or three witnesses of men, beyond exception, will cast a man out of, not onely his lands, but life and all. He that amongst Merchants will not adventure, when there is a hundred to one of gaining well, will be accompted a silly Factor. And amongst Souldiers, he that will feare danger where but one of a hundred is slaine, shall not escape the stain of Cowardise. What then shall we expect in Religion, but to see a maine advantage on the one side, we may

may cast our selves on? and for the rest remember we are men, creatures subject to chance and mutability, and thank God he hath given us that assurance in a supernaturall way, which we are content withall, in our naturall and civill ventures and possessions, which nevertheless God knoweth we often love better, and would lesse hazard then the unknowne good of the life to come. Yet peradventure, God hath provided better for his Church then for Nature, since he loved her more, and in his own Person did more for her. Let us therefore examine the assurance he hath left her particularly. It was found in the second Chapter, upon this principle, that so great a multitude of men as cleave to this ground (to have received their faith by tradition) could not conspire by lying, to deceive their posterity. And if I be not deceived, this principle being granted, the conclusion (that this present Church is the true) followeth in as severe a way of discourse, as in *Aristotles* Organ is taught, and exemplified in *Mathematicall* Writers; whose use and art it is to put the like suppositions, whence to enduce something out against their principle. As in the said Chapter you are bidden, to put what yeare, or age such an error entred, and it is evidently true, that if it be true, then that yeare or age conspired to tell a lye to deceive their posterity. And as for the strength of their principle it selfe (although no morall man can be so absurd as to doubt of it) yet may we consider, that the understanding being the part, which maketh man to be a man, and truth being the perfection of

of our understanding, and true speech the effect, naturall to true knowledge, or understanding: It is cleare, that to speak truth is as naturall a fruit of mans nature, as Peares of a Peare tree, Grapes of a Vine, Hony of the Bee: and that it can be no lesse grafted in nature, for men to speak truly, then it is in any other naturall cause to yeeld the fruit, for whose sake nature bred the cause. Wherefore as the constancy of the effect sheweth, that it holdeth upon eternall principles, that no one species of perfect creatures can perish, although we are not so skilfull of nature, as hansomely to weave the demonstration; so cannot it be doubted, but that if one had all the principles of mans nature well digested, he might demonstratively deduce the impossibility, of (that such multitudes of men should conspire to a lye) the variety of particulars, ever holding their being from a constancy and uniformity in the universall. Adde to this the notoriousnesse of the lye, such as he is rarely found, that is, so wicked as to venture upon; besides the greatnesse of the subject, and of the danger ensuing upon himselfe, and his deareſt pledges. The ground therefore assumed, is a demonstrative principle, and peradventure in a higher degree then most physicall principles be: For who knoweth not the nature of the soule, to be the highest thing Physicks can reach unto? Who knoweth not, that immateriall things are lesse subject to mutability then those which are grounded in matter? Then as more noble, and as more immateriall, it hath greater exemption from mutability, then

any

any other naturall cauſe whatſoever. One addition more, may chance to cleare the whole buſineſſe more fully. Nothing more cleare then that, no naturall cauſe faileth of his effect, without there be ſome impediment from a ſtronger. Now the impediments which hinder a man from ſpeaking truth, experience teacheth us, to be no other then hopes and feares. The ſame experience giveth us to know, that it is a rare thing, that hopes and feares ſhould comprehend ſo great multitudes, as are in the union of the Catholique Church, ſpecially during an age, which is the leaſt time neceſſary for the effect we ſpeak of, that what peradventure might at one time be ill admitted, ſhould not be rejected at another. But if there were; can any man be ſo mad as to think, it could be a ſecret hope or feare, which ſhould not break out amongſt the poſterity, and be knowen, that what was done was not true, but counterfeited upon feare or intereſt, which if it were, a whole ages counterfeiting would not be ſufficient to make the poſterity beleeve, they had received ſuch a point of doctrine by tradition. Wherefore I doe not ſee, how this principle of tradition, and the doctrine received by it, can be accompted of leſſe certainty, then any Phyſicall demonſtration whatſoever; or Faith upon this ground not as ſure as any naturall cauſe, as the courſe of Sunne and Moon, as the flowing and ebbing of the Sea, as the Summer and Winter, Sowing and Harveſt, and whatſoever we undoubtedly preſume upon the like nature, and kind.

The principle which is taken in the following Chapter, is of no lesse force (if not of far better) to who rightly understandeth the nature of God his workes, whose course it is deeplier to root and strengthen those things which he would have most to flourish, or whereof he hath most care. Now Christians well know, that God Almighty hath made mankind for his elect, as the world which is about us for mankind. And therefore he hath rooted those things which more immediately belong to the Elect (as is his Church, his Faith, and Holy Spirit in it) more strongly then the principles either of mans nature, or of the world which was made for it: himselfe assuring us of it, when he told us, *One title should not misse of the holy Writ, though Heaven and Earth should be dissolved.* And so seeing the latter principle, relyed upon the not failing of Gods Holy Spirit to his Church, which should ever watch upon their actions, that nothing should creep into Christian life, which persently the zeale of his faithfull should not startle at. I think it needlesse to seek to further *qualifie* the strength of that part, which receiveth it from the quality of so good a workman as was the Holy Ghost.

CHAP.

Chap. V.

I Doubt not but whosoever shall have received satisfaction in the discourse passed, will also have received in that point we seeke after; that is in being assured both that Christ hath left a Director in the world, and where to find him, there being left no doubt, but it is his holy Church upon earth. Nor can there be any question, which is this Church, sithence there is but one that doth and can lay claime, to have received from hand to hand his holy doctrine in writings and hearts. Others may cry loud, they have found it, but they must first confesse it was lost: and so if they have, it was not received by hands, I meane, as far as it disagreeth with Catholique doctrine; so that where there is not so much as claime, there can be no dispute. And that this Church is a lawfull directresse, that is, hath the conditions requisite, I think can no wayes be doubted. Let us consider in her, presence, or visibility, authority, power. As for the first, her multitude and succession, makes the Church if she is ever accessible, ever knowen. The *Arrians* seemed to chase her out of the world in their flourish, but the persecution moved against her, made her even then well known and admired. In our owne Countrey we have seen no Bishop, no forme of Church for many yeares; yet never so, but that the course of justice did proclaime her through *England*, and who was

curious could never want meanes to come to know her confession of faith what it is, and upon what it is grounded. Whereſoever ſhe is, if in peace, her Majeſty and Ceremonies in all her actions, make her ſpectable and admired. If in war, ſhe never wanteth Champions to maintain her, and the very heat of her adverſaries, makes her known to ſuch as are deſirous to underſtand the truth of a matter ſo important, as is the eternall welfare of our ſoule.

For *Authority*: her very claime of antiquity and ſucceſſion (to have been that Church which received her beginning from Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and never forewent it, but hath ever maintained it) giveth a great reverence unto her amongſt thoſe, who beleeve her, and amongſt thoſe, who with indifferency and love of truth, ſeek to inform themſelves; a great prejudice above others: For it draweth a greater likelyhood of truth, then others have. And if it be true, it carrieth an infinite authority with it, of Biſhops, Doctors, Martyrs, Saints, miracles, learning, wiſedome, venerable antiquity, and the like: that if a prudent man ſhould ſit with himſelfe and conſider, that if he were to chuſe what kind of one he would have it, to carry away the hearts of men towards the admiration and love of God Almighty, he could find nothing wanting in this, that could be maintained with the fluxibility of nature. For to ſay, he would have no wicked men in it, were to ſay, he would have it made of Angels and not of Men.

There remaineth *Power*: the which no man can

can doubt but Christ hath given it most ample, who considereth his words so often repeated to his Apostles. But (abstracting from that) who doth not see, that the Church hath the nature and proportion of ones Country, unto every one? As in a mans Country, he hath Father, and Mother, Brothers, Sisters, Kinsfolkes, Allyes, Neighbours, and Country-men, which anciently were called *Cives*, or *Concives*, and of these are made his Country; so in the Church findeth he in way of spirituall instruction and education, all these degrees neerer and farther off, untill he come unto that furthermost of being, of all united under the universall Government of Christ his Vicar: And as he in his Countrey findeth bearing, breeding, setting in estates and fortunes, and lastly protection and security; so likewise in the way of Christianity doth he find this more fully in the Church: so that if it be true, that a man oweth more unto his Master then unto his Father, because *bene esse* is better then *esse*: certainly a man also (as far as Church and Country can be separated) must owe more to the Church then to his very Country; wherefore likewise the power which the Church hath to command and instruct, is greater then the power of the temporall Country, and community, whereof he is part; Againe, this Church can satisfie learned and unlearned. For in matters above the reach of reason, whose source and spring is from what Christ and his Apostles taught, what learned man, that understands the nature of science and method, can refuse in his inmost soule to bow

to that which is testified by so great a multitude, to have come from Christ? And what unlearned man can require more for his faith, then to be taught by a Mistresse of so many prerogatives and advantages above all others? Or how can he think to be quieted in conscience, if he be not content to fare as she doth, who hath this prerogative, evident that none is so likely by thousands of degrees.

Chap. VI.

THe stemme and body of our position thus raised, will of it selfe shoot out the branches of divers Questions, or rather the solution thereof.

And first, *How it hapned that diverse Heretiques have pretended tradition* (*the* Millenarians, Carpocratians, Gnostiaks, *and divers others*) *yet they with their traditions have been rejected, and the holy Church left onely in claime of tradition?*

For if we look into, what Catholique tradition is, and what the said Heretiques pretended, under the name of Tradition, the question will remain voided. For the Catholique Church calleth Tradition, that doctrine which was publikely preached in the Churches, ordred and planted in the manners and customes of the Church. The Heretiques called Tradition a kind of secret doctrine, either gathered out of private conversation with the Apostles, or rather they pretended that the Apostles, besides what they publikely taught the

the world, had another private or mysticall way proper to Schollers, more endeared then the rest, which came not to publike view, but was in huggermugger delivered from those secret Disciples unto others, and so unto them; where it is easily seen, what difference there is betwixt this Catholique Tradition and this pretended. For (the force and energie of tradition residing in the multitudes of hearers, and being planted in the perpetuall action, and life of Christians, so that it must have such a publicity that it cannot be unknown amongst them.) Those the Heretiques pretend both manifestly, want the life and being of traditions, and by the very great report of them lose all authority and name. For, suppose some private doctrine of an Apostle to some Disciple, should be published and recorded by that Disciple, and some others, this might well be a truth, but would never obtain the force of a Catholique position, that is, such as it should be damnation to reject, because the descent from the Apostle is not notorious, and fitting to sway the body of the whole Church.

The Second Question may be, *How it commeth to passe, that something which at first bindeth not the Churches beleef, afterward commeth to bind it? For if it were ever a Tradition it must ever be publique, and bind the Church: And if once it were not, it appeareth not how ever it could come to be; for if this age, (for example) hath it not, how can it deliver it over to the next age that followeth?*

But if we consider, that the hope of Christian doctrine

ctrine being great, and the Apoſtles preaching in ſo great varietie of Countries, it might happen ſome point in one Countrie to have been leſſe underſtood, or peradventure not preached at all, which in another was often preached, and well both underſtood and retained; we may eaſily free our ſelves from theſe brambles. For the Spirit of Tradition reſiding in this, that the teſtimony of that, *the Apoſtles delivered this Doctrine* be *exceptione majus*, and beyond all danger of deceit; It is not neceſſary to the efficaciouſneſs of Tradition, that the whole univerſall Church be witneſſe to ſuch a truth, but ſo great a part as could be a Warrant againſt miſtaking and deceit; ſo that if all the Churches of *Aſia*, or *Greece*, or *Aphrique*, or *Egypt*, ſhould conſtantly affirm ſuch a Doctrine to have been delivered unto them by the Apoſtles, it were enough to make a Doctrine *exceptione majorem*: Whence it inſueth that if in a meeting of the Univerſall Church it were found that ſuch a part had ſuch a Tradition, concerning ſome matter, whereof the reſt either had no knowledge or no certainty, ſuch a Doctrine would paſſe into a neceſſary bond in the whole Church, which before was either unknown or doubted of in ſome part thereof. A likely example thereof might be in the Canonicall bookes, the which being written ſome to one Church, and ſome to another, by little and little were ſpread from thoſe Churches unto others, and ſo ſome ſooner, ſome later, received into the conſtant beleife of the Catholique world.

The

The Third queſtion may be, *How (Chriſtian religion, conſiſting in ſo many points) it is poſsible to be kept incorrupted by tradition, the which depending on memory, and our memory being ſo fraile, and ſubject to variation, it ſeemeth, cannot without manifeſt miracle, conſerve ſo great diverſity of points unchanged, for ſo many ages?*

But if we conſider, that Faith is a Science, and Science a thing whoſe parts are ſo connexed, that if one be falſe, all muſt needs be falſe, we ſhall eaſily ſee that contrarily; the multitude of divers points is a conſervation the one to the other. For, if one be certaine, it of it ſelfe is able to bring us to the right in another, whereof we doubt. And as in a mans body, if he wanteth one member, or the operation of it, he muſt needs find the want of it in another: And as a Common-wealth that is well ordained, cannot miſſe any office or part, without the redounding of the deſſect upon the whole, or ſome other part; ſo a Chriſtian, being an eſſence inſtituted by God, as ſpecially as any naturall creature, hath not the parts of his faith and action by accident and chance knitted together, but all parts by a naturall order, and will of the Maker, ordred for the conſervation of the moſt inward eſſence, which is the charity we owe to God, and our Neighbour. Wherefore Chriſtian life and action conſiſteth but upon one main tradition, whoſe parts be thoſe particulars, which men ſpecifie, either in matter of Beleefe or Action: So that this connexion of its parts amongſt themſelves, added to the Spirit

of God, ever conſerving zeale in the heart of his Church, with thoſe helpes alſo of nature (wherewith we ſee wonders in this kind done) will ſhew this conſervation to be ſo far from impoſſibility, that it will appeare a moſt con-naturall and fitting thing. Let us but conſider, in conſtant nations, their language, their habits, their manners of ſacrificing, eating, generally living; how long it doth continne amongſt them. See that forlorne nation of *Jewes*, how conſtantly it maintaineth the Scripture? how obſtinately their errors? The *Arabians* of the deſert, from *Iſmael* his time unto this day, live in families, wandring about the deſert. Where Chriſtians labour to convert Idolaters, they find the maine and onely argument for their errors, that they received them from their fore-fathers, and will not quit them. The King of *Socotora*, thinking to pleaſe the *Portugals* by reducing a nation, that had the name of Chriſtians, to true Chriſtianity, he found them obſtinately proteſt unto him, that they would ſooner loſe their lives, then part with the religion their Anceſtors had left them. The *Maronites*, a ſmall handfull of people, amongſt *Turks* and *Heretiques*, to this day have maintained their religion in *Siria*. And certainly thouſands of examples of this kind may be collected in all Nations and Countries; eſpecially, if they be either rude, and ſuch as mingle not with others, or ſuch as be wiſe, and out of wiſedome ſeek to maintaine their ancient beleefe. And Catholiques are of both natures: For they have ſtrict commands,

not

not to come to the Ceremonies and Rites of other religions, and in their own, they have all meanes imaginable to affect them to it, and conserve a reverence and zeale towards it.

CHAP. VII.

TO come at length to the principall aime of this Treatise, that is, to give an answer to him that demandeth a guide at my hands. I remit him to the moderne present visible Church of *Rome*, that is, her, who is in an externe sensible communion with the externe sensible Clergy of *Rome*, and the externe sensible Head and Pastour of the Church. If he aske me now, how he shall know her? (I suppose he meaneth, how he should know her to be the true) I must contreinterrogate him, who he is? that is, in whose name he speaketh? Is he an ignorant man? Is he unlearned? yet of good understanding in the world? Is he a Scholler? and what Scholler? A Gramarian, whose understanding hath no other helpe then of languages? Is he a Phylosopher? Is he a Divine? (I meane an Academicall one, for a true Divine is to teach, not to aske this question:) Is he a Statesman? For he who can think one answer, can or ought be made to all these; may likewise expect, that a round bowle may stop a square hole, or one cause produce all effects, and hang lead at his heels to fly withall. Yet I deny not, but all these must have the same guide,

though they are to be assured of, that in divers sorts and manners. If therefore the ignorant man speaketh, I will shew him in the Church of God an excellencie in decencie, Majestie of Ceremonies above all other Sects and Religions, whereby dull capacities are sweetly ensnared, to beleeve the truth they hear, from whom they see to have the outward Signs of vertue and devotion. If the unlearned ask; I shew him the claim of Antiquitie, the multitude, the advantages of sanctity and learning, the justifiableness of the cause, how the world was once in this accord, and those who opposed, when they first parted, first began the Schism; how the points of difference be such as on the Catholike side help devotion, and on the contrary diminish the same, and such like sensible differences which will clearly shew a main advantage on the Catholike side, which is the proportionall motive to his understanding: To the Grammarian I will give two *Memorandums*.

First, that seeing Catholiques were first in possession both of the Scriptures and the interpretations, the adverse part is bound to bring such places as can receive no probable Exposition by the Catholikes. It is not sufficient that their Expositions seem good or better; that is, more conformable unto the Text, but they must be evincent, to which no so sound answer, even with some impropriety can be given. For who knoweth not, that is conversant in Criticks, how many obscure, and difficult places occurre in most plain Authors: and the Scripture of all Books (the greater part of the

the men who wrote them, specially the new Testament, being not eloquent, and writing not in their native tongue) for the most part are subject to many Improprieties.

The other *Memorandum* is, That to prove a Catholike point by Scripture, it is sufficient that the place brought, do bear the Explication the Catholike beareth, and if it be more probable by the very letter, it is an evincent place. The reason is, Because the Question being about a Christian Law, the Axioms of the Jurists taketh place that *Consuetudo optima interpres Legis*. So that if it be manifest that Christian practise (which was before the controversie) be for the one sense, and the words be tolerable, no force of Grammar can prevail to equalize this advantage. The Grammarian therefore who will observe these rules, I turn him loose to the Scriptures, and Fathers to seek in them what is the faith of Christ, and properties of his Church to know her by. Of the the Philosopher I exact to go like a Philosopher, and to search out the specificall differences of every Sect, and when he hath found them, *if any one but the Catholike hath any rule of Faith and good life*: which I remit to him to enquire? But at least when he hath found the Catholiques to be this claim of Tradition before declared, then, if this doe not bring him as demonstratively, as he knoweth any conclusion in Philosophie, and Mathematicks, to the notice that this is the only true Church of Christ, for my part I shall quit him before God and man. The Divine if he hath tra-

ly understood the principles of his Faith in the nature of a Divine (I mean, *Trinity*, *Incarnation*, *Redemption*, *Eucharist*, *Beatitude*, the *Creation* and *Dissolution* of the World) and hath seen the exact conformitie with the deepest principles of nature, with an unspeakable wisedome of the contriver: If he does not plainly confesse it was above the nature of man to frame the Catholike Religion, and seeth not that onely, that is conformable to nature and it selfe; I say, he hath no ground sufficient to be of it. At last, the Statesman who is truly informed of the Church, (how far it is really of Christs Institution, and what either pious men have added, or peradventure, ambitious men encroached,) If he does not find a government of so high and Exotick strain, that neither mans wit would dare to have attempted it, neither mans power could possibly have effected it. If he findeth not eminent helpes, and no disadvantage to the temporall government, I shall think there wanteth one Star in the Heaven of the Church, to direct these Sages to *Bethlehem*. But if God Almighty hath in all sorts and manners provided his Church, that she may enlighten every man in his way, which goeth the way of a man; then let every man consider, which is the fit way for himselfe, and what in other matters of that way he accompteth evidence. And, if there be no interest in his soule, to make him loath to beleeve, what in another matter of the like nature he would not stick at, or heavy to practise what he seeth clearly enough, I feare not his choice; but if God send him time

and

and meanes to proſecute his ſearch any indifferent while, it is long ago known of what religion he is to be of

After this followeth no order of Chapters, becauſe it is applied to the diſcourſe which was occaſion of it.

Although if what is already be not ſatisfaction unto the writing, and the Author thereof, (for whoſe ſake and contentment, all that hath been diſcourſed hitherto, hath been ſet down:) I confeſſe, that I have not ability to give him ſatisfaction: yet leaſt it ſhould be interpreted neglect, If I did not make an application of it unto the writing, I ſhall as breifly as I can, for avoiding tediouſneſſe, runne over the diſcourſe. And true it is, ſpeaking of the Church of *Rome*, as this day it is the true Church of God: I anſwer the doubter, ſhe neither hath, nor can have any error, which he need to feare, and be ſhye of. The which two limitations I adde, for avoiding queſtions, impertinent to our diſcourſe. The firſt, for thoſe which are concerning the connection of the Sea of *Rome* to the univerſall Church. The latter, to avoid ſuch queſtions as touch that point, whether the Church may erre, in any Phyloſophicall or other ſuch like matter? which queſtions are not ſo pertinent to our matter.

Neither doe I remit the Queſtioner unto Scripture for his ſatisfaction, although I hold Scripture

ture a very sufficient meanes, to satisfie the man, who goeth to it with that preparation of understanding and will, which is meet and required. Howsoever this I may answer, for them who prove it out of Scripture, that because they dispute against them who admit of Scripture, and deny the authority of the Church, if they can convince it, they doe well; though they will not themselves admit generally of a proofe out of Scripture, as not able to prove every thing in *foro contentioso.*

That they say, the Church is made infallible, that we may have some guide, I think it very rationall. For nature hath given ever some strong and uncontroulable principle in all natures to guide the rest. The Common-wealth hath a Governour not questionable, our understanding hath some principles, which she cannot judge, but by them judgeth of all other verities. If there should not be some such principle in the Church, it were the onely maimed thing God had created; and maimed in its principall part, in the very head. And if there be such a principle, the whole Church is infallible by that, as the whole man seeth by his eyes, toucheth by his hands. Neither can I deny, but that the Author well excepteth, or assumeth, that there is no lesse necessity, the Church should be known to be infallible, or which is this Church, then that there is one. For if I should admit absolutely, that it is necessary for every man to know the Church is Infallible, precedently to the knowledge of which is the true Church, I should forget

forget what I had before said, that satisfaction is to be given to every one, according to his capacity. It is sufficient for a Childe to beleeve his Parents, for a Clown to beleeve his Preacher, about the Churches Infallibility. For Faith is given to mankind, to be a meanes to him of beleeving, and living like a Christian: and so he hath this second, it is not much matter in what termes he be with the first. The good women and Clownes in *Italy*, and *Spaine*, trouble not themselves to seek the grounds of their faith, but with a Christian simplicity, seek to live according unto that their Preachers tell them; and without question, by perseverance, come to the happinesse, great Clearks by too much speculation may faile of. Such therefore know no otherwise the Infallibility of the Church, then becaus she telleth it them, to whom they give credit, as innocently as any child to his Mother.

The Church therefore was made infallible, becaus so it was fitting for her Maker, so it was fitting for her selfe, so it was fit for that part of mankind, that had more refined wits; not becaus it was necessary for every one which was to come to her, or live in her, whereof the greatest part first commeth to her, drawn by some of the meanes before delivered, and beleeveth her about her infallibility.

Neither doe I remit him to a generall and constant tradition, as if himselfe should climbe up every age by learned Writers, and find it in every one. I take it to be impossible. Testimonies

one may find in many ages, but such as will demonstrate and convince, a full tradition, I much doubt. Neither doe I find by experience, that who will draw a man by a rope or chain, giveth him the whole rope or chaine into his hands, but onely one end of it, unto which if he cleave hard, he shall be drawn which way the rope is carried. Tradition is a long chaine, every generation or delivery from father to sonne, being a link in it. I send him therefore no further then to this present age, where he shall (beyond all doubtfulnesse) find that this doctrine was delivered unto this age, by the care of their Ancestors. And if we seek upon what termes, we find, that upon a fixed opinion of damnation in failing; and so, that they had received it so from their fore-fathers upon the same termes, with opinion that it had continued ever since Christ his time by this meanes. And he who is able to look into the meanes, how this can remaine constantly so many ages, may find it not onely the far securer, but an evidently infallible succession of doctrine, inviolable as long as there is a Church. And this doth not onely shew that there is one, but which the is, and that there can be no other. For I suppose, no man will be so senseless as to say, the Apostles preached one thing in one part, and the contrary in another: wherefore it will be agreed, that once the Church agreed in her faith. This supposed, let us set the time when one part changed, and will it not be evident, that the changing Church being challenged cannot plead, she received

ceived it from her Ancestors, because it is manifestly false to both parties? Then must needs one onely Church remain with that claime. And although we did not know what the *Greek* Church doth by her History, yet the force of consequence would tell us, they cannot doe this which the Westerne Church doth, because the doing of one is incompatible with the doing of the same by the other.

As for the two places concerning the Popes and Councels infallibility, it is not to my purpose to medle of them, because on the one side, the way I have begun, there is no need of those discourses; and on the other, I should engage my selfe in quarrels betwixt Catholique, and Catholique, obscure the matter I have taken in hand, and profit nothing in my hearers, more then to be judged, peradventure to have more learning then wisedome to governe it withall. Wherefore I shall omit those Paragraphes, if I onely note concerning the tradition imposed upon *Papius*, that the very narration of it, sheweth that it is no tradition, in the sence we speak of tradition, but in the sence some Heretiques have pretended tradition; as it were a doctrine secretly delivered, and gathered out of private conference with the Apostles, and not their publique preaching delivered to the Churches, which is the way we exalt tradition in. The witnesses also of ancient Fathers are no parts of tradition, but signes and markes where it hath passed, whereas the body of tradition is in the life and beleife of the whole Church. For the Church

(as I have ſaid) is an eſſence compoſed, as it were, of interne and externe parts; the interne being faith, the externe, the outward action, which muſt needs be conformable to the internall faith, nor can there be a materiall change in the action, but it muſt argue the internall change of faith, nor internall change in faith, but it muſt draw with it an Iliad of altered actions.

As for the place of *Fevardentius*, which alloweth many Fathers to have fallen into errors, I thinke it will not trouble him, who is acquainted with the courſe of the preſent Church, wherein divers, who be thought great Divines, fall into errors, for which their bookes ſometimes are hindred from the print, ſometimes recalled, or ſome leaves commanded to be paſted up. The reaſon is, the multiplicity of Catholique doctrine, which doth not oblige a man to the knowledge of every part, but to the prompt ſubjection, to the inſtruction of the Church, wherefore many men may hold falſe doctrine inculpably, not knowing it to be ſuch, even now after the learned labours of ſo many, that have ſtrived to open and facilitate by method, what is true and what is falſe; much more in the Fathers times, when there was great want of ſo many compilers, as theſe latter ages have produced.

As for the two points, he ſaith, avert him from Catholique doctrine, I am miſtaken, if he be not miſtaken in both. The firſt is, that Catholique doctrine damnes all, who are not in the union of their Church. He thinketh the ſentence hard,

yet,

yet, I thinke he will not deny me this, that if any Church does not say so, it cannot be the true Church: For call the Church what you will, the Congregation of the Elect, the Congregation of the Faithfull, the Congregation of Saints, or Just; call it, I say, or define it what you will, doth it not clearly follow, that whosoever is out of that Church cannot be saved; for he shall not be Elect, Just, Faithfull, &c. without which there is no Salvation. How then can any Church maintaine these two propositions? I am the true Church, and yet one may be saved, without being in me. But peradventure he is scandalized, that the Catholique Church requireth actuall communion, externall with her, which he thinketh in some case may be wanting, without detriment of Salvation. But how would he have the Church speake, which speaketh in common, but abstracting from such particular cases, as may change wholly the nature of the question. For example sake; hath not the Church reason to say, he that denyeth the blessed Trinity is an Heretique? It hapneth, one who hath conversed among the *Tritheites*, hearing them use the word Trinity for three Gods, meaning to speak against them, denyeth there is any Trinity; shall this man be comprehended in the foresaid condemnation? Or was the sentence ill pronounced? Neither, as I think. For both was it well done by the Church, to condemne denyers of the Trinity, because *per se loquendo* (as the Philosophers speak) that is, according to the ordinary course, and nature of things, who denyeth a thing

in words, denyeth it in heart; yet the man foreſpoken, did not ſo, and was not condemned in that ſentence. In like manner, when the Church condemneth all ſuch as are not in actuall union, and communion with her, ſhe doth well: becauſe according to the ordinary courſe, this doth not fall out, without either preſumption, and damnable pride, or elſe culpable, either ignorance, or feare, and love of private intereſt, before God and his Church. But it followeth not thence, that by accident no man may ſometime be excuſed. The words of our Saviour concerning Baptiſme and Euchariſt their neceſſity, are very preciſe, yet the Church doubteth not to excuſe thoſe who have it in *voto*.

But to proceed unto the point. The corrent of Catholique Doctors holdeth, that no man ſhall be damned for infidelity, but he who wilfully doth miſ-beleeve, and that to doe ſo, it is required that faith be ſufficiently propoſed unto him. And what is to be ſufficiently propoſed, is not determined amongſt them. There wanteth not Divines, that teach, that even *ignorantia affectata*, doth excuſe from Heriſie.

On the other ſide it is moſt certaine, that no man is damned for not profeſſing, what he is not damned for not beleeving. Wherefore profeſſion being that which engrafteth a man exteriorly in the Church of God, according unto the ordinary opinions of Catholiques; it followeth, that no man is condemned for not being of the Church, who is not for infidelity, for which it is a very uncertaine

uncertaine caſe, who be damned and who not. So that the Catholique poſition is not ſo crude, as peradventure the Author underſtood it to be, though the words be rough, and ought to be ſo, as being of what is according to the courſe of nature, not what chance and accideuts may invent.

The other point was of puting Heretiques to death, which I think he underſtandeth to be done Vindicatively, not Medicinally. I meane impoſed as a puniſhment, and not in way to prevent miſcheife, or oppreſſe it in the head. If the *Circumcellians* were the firſt, that is ancient enough for the juſtification of the fact, although for baniſhment (which alſo he ſeemeth to reprehend) we know the firſt that could ſuffer it, did ſuffer it. *Arrius*, I meane, by the hand of *Conſtantine*, whom he praiſeth for a ſpeech he uttered, before he knew the conſequence of the danger, and ſeemeth to reprehend for his after and better wits. Saint *Auguſtine* juſtifieth ſuch proceeding againſt Heretiques. Saint *Gregory* adviſed the like againſt *Pagans*, (if I remember) and the Church laterly, hath rather increaſed then decreaſed in the practiſe of it. *Mores*'s ſpeech, I beleeve is miſtaken, the force of it being, that the baniſhment of Biſhops ſhewed his faith, becauſe the baniſhed were Catholiques, which ſhewed *Lucius* to be none. But what can be ſaid, if the Church uſeth that for the prevention of a greater, and more dangerous evill, which all politique Eſtates uſe for the remedies of leſſe, and leſſe dangerous evils, and are commended for it? For if Faith be the way of Salvation.

and

and hereby the bane of Faith; if Salvation be the greateſt good, then the danger of a Countries being over runne with Hereſie, is the greateſt of dangers, greater then the multiplying of Theeves, greater then the unſurety of the wayes, greater then a Plague, or Invaſion. Why then doth not reaſon force us to uſe the meanes to prevent it, which the ſame reaſon and experience, teacheth us to be moſt efficacious in this, and all other contagious and gangrening maladies of the Common-wealth. I hope reaſon it ſelfe, and the zeale of the Author to his own and Countries Salvation, will ſupply my ſhortneſſe in this point. For ſuppoſing a Church be aſſured ſhe is in the right, and that the doctrine preached by another, leadeth to damnation, I know not why *Caipha's* words ſhould not be propheticall in this caſe, and that truly it doth not *expedire*, that *unus moriatur pro populo, & non tota gens pereat.*

He urgeth afterwards againſt the unity of the Church, that it is none ſuch as we brag off. And I confeſſe we brag of it, and thinke we have reaſon too. And if it pleaſe him to look into the difference of our Country of *England*, and ſome Land of *Barbarians*, as *Braſile*, or ſuch other, where they live without Law or Government. I thinke he will find, that our bragging is not without ground. For wherein is the difference betwixt a civill Government, and a barbarous Anarchie? Is it either, that in a civill Eſtate there be no quarrels, or amongſt *Barbarians* there is no quiet. The former would prejudice our Courts and Juſtice, the

the latter is impossible, even in nature. What is then the goodnesse of Government, but that in a well govern'd Country, there is a meanes to end quarrels, and in an Anarchy there can be no assured peace? This therefore is that we brag of, that amongst us, if any controversie rise, there is a way to end it, which is not amongst them who part from us. And secondly, that there is no assured agreement amongst those who are parted from us; for although to day they agree, there is no bond, nor tye, why to morrow they may not disagree. These two things we brag of, and I think the Author will not deny it. For he confesseth we all agree, in that the Church is an infallible Mistresse. Then it is evident, that if in any controversie she interposeth her judgement, the controversie is ended. He likewise confesseth, that who part from us, have no such definitive authority amongst them, and that Scripture whereon they relie, hath not this vertue, to take up controversies clearly. Againe, I doe confesse, most English men confesse a Trinity, the Incarnation, and Passion of our Saviour, but if to morrow, any one or more of them, light upon some book of an *Arrian*, *Trinitarian*, or other Sect, so wittily written, that he putteth probable solutions for the places of Scriptures, sheweth slight wayes, how our well-meaning fore-fathers may have slipped into such an error; what is there to retaine these men, from disagreeing with the rest of their brethern, and betake themselves to the *Arrians*: And when the heat is passed,

light upon some Rabbi, who shall cunningly exaggerate the absurdities (as he shall terme them) of the Trinity, Incarnation, Passion; say our Saviour did strange things in vertue of some constellation, and delivering these things so oratorically, that for a new heat these things shall seem more conformable, then his *Arrianisme*; what then shall hinder this to become a *Jew*, and at last to prove himselfe so great a Clerk, as to write *De Tribus Impostoribus*. Take away the power of the Church (which every man doth, who taketh away the Infallibility) what can retaine any man, why he should not yeeld to that discourse, which seemeth fairest, seeing nothing is certaine? But peradventure, some may attribute power unto the Church without Infallibility, whom I would have consider, but what himselfe saith. For his Church, by the power it hath, must either say, I command you to beleeve me, or I command you to professe this, whether you beleeve me or no. The second I think, no enemy of equivocation will admit, as the former is as much, as if it should say, I know not whether I say true or no, yet you must think I say true. So that if I understand any thing, where there is no Infallibility, there is no Power, where no Power, no Unity, where no Unity, no Entity, no Church. Now for the controversies mentioned (besides that, there is a meanes to terminate them) they be such, as bring no breach of the ancient life, and action of Christians, which all those Opinions doe, which for the most part are reputed to make Heretiques; That some controversies

troverſies amongſt us are not reſolved, is a thing neceſſary amongſt humane affaires, where things muſt have a time to be borne, to encreaſe, to fall; and the greater things are, the greater is their period. Wherefore I doe not ſee, why this may hurt the Church, more then the Suits which hang in our Courts, prejudice the Government of the Land. Neither can any other Church aſſume Infallibility to it ſelfe; becauſe it cannot lay hold of this principle, that it receiveth its doctrine by hands; and ſo muſt firſt profeſſe the Church of Chriſt to be fallible, or elſe it cannot part from it.

The laſt point of the Authors diſcourſe, is, to ſhew how errors might have crept in. Wherein I ſhall have no oppoſition with him, for I doe not thinke the queſtion is, how they ſhould creep in, but how they ſhould be kept out? For the fluxibility of humane nature is ſo great, that it is no wonder if errors ſhould have crept in, the wayes being ſo many, but it is a great wonder of God, that none ſhould have crept in. This nevertheleſſe I may ſay, (if the Author will confeſſe, (as I think) he will not deny, but that it is diſputable, whether any error in ſixteen ages hath crept in) this very thing is above nature. For if there were not an excellency beyond the nature of corruptible things, it would be undeniably evident, that not one or two, but hundreds of errors had quite changed the ſhape of the Church in ſo many yeares, tempeſts, diviſions, want of commerce in the body of the Church. But this one

maxime, that ſhe receiveth her Faith by Tradition, and not from Doctors, hath ever kept her entire. And he that will ſhew the contrary, muſt ſhew how it could come to paſſe, that thoſe who lived in ſuch an age, could ſay unto their children, this we received from our fore-fathers, as taught them by their fore-fathers, to have been received from Chriſt and his Apoſtles, from hand to hand; which if it could not be, the queſtion is reſolved, that no error is in the Church of God, which holdeth her faith upon that tenure.

And truly, if the Author deſire to examine many Religions, let him look their main ground wherein they relye, and ſee whether that be good or no. And I thinke amongſt Chriſtians he ſhall find but two, Tradition, and Scripture. And the Catholique onely to relye upon Tradition, and all the reſt upon Scripture. And alſo ſhall he ſee, that relying upon Scripture cannot draw to an unity, thoſe who relye upon it; and that more then one cannot relye upon Tradition, which when I have conſidered, I have no further to ſeeke, for if I will be a Chriſtian, I muſt belong to one ſide. By falling on the one ſide, I ſee my fortune in thouſands who have gone before me, to wit, that I ſhall be to ſeek all my life time, as I ſee they are, and how greatly they magnifie very weak peices. On the other ſide, I ſee every man who followeth it, as far as he follow it, is at quiet; and therefore cannot chuſe, but think there to be the ſtone to reſt my head upon, againſt which *Jacob* his Ladder is reared unto Heaven.

The

The Author hath through his whole diſcourſe, inſerted divers things, which ſeem particularly to the juſtification of himſelfe, in the way of his ſearch. The which, as I think, on one ſide I ſhould be too blame to examine (for who am I, to judge the Servant of another man) ſo, becauſe I cannot think, but that they were inſerted for love of truth, and to heare what might be ſaid againſt them (craving pardon, if on preſumption of that, it is his will, I any way offend) I ſhall touch the matter, wholly abſtracting from the perſonall diſpoſition of any man. And to begin a far of, it is confeſſed amongſt Catholiques, that all ſinne muſt be wilfull, and ſo as far as any mans doubt in Religion is not by will, but by force and neceſſity, ſo far it is not culpable, but may be laudable before God and man. As was without doubt the anxious ſearch of Saint *Auguſtine* for the truth, which he relateth in his confeſſions, for who is aſſured of being out of the truth; muſt have time to ſeek it, and ſo long this doubt is rationall, and laudable. That which muſt juſtifie this ſearch, is in common, that which juſtifieth all actions, that a man be ſure in the aime he aimeth at, and in the meanes he taketh, not to be governed by any paſſion, intereſt, or wilfulneſſe, but that he ſincerely aimeth, and carefully purſueth in the ſearch of the truth it ſelfe, for the love of it; and of thoſe goods which depend of the knowledge of it. This is a thing, in which a rationall man can have no other judge then himſelfe; for no man knoweth what is within a man, but

the Spirit, or conſcience of man. But he himſelfe muſt be a rigorous Judge unto himſelfe, for it is very hard to know the truth: when I ſay rigorous, I mean exact, and fearfull miſ-deeming: As holy *Job* was, who ſaid, *He was fearfull of all his actions.* Holy *David*, but amongſt all, Saint *Auguſtine* doth more ſweetly complaine of the miſery of man, not knowing his own diſpoſitions, and yet he was then forty yeares of age, when paſſions and heates of youth which make this diſcuſſion harder, are generally ſettled. Beſides this, he muſt have this care, that he ſeek what the nature of the ſubject can yeeld, and not as thoſe Phyſitians, who when they have promiſed no leſſe then immortality, can at laſt onely reach to ſome conſervation of health, or youth, in ſome ſmall degree. So I could wiſh the Author, to well aſſure himſelfe firſt, that there is poſſible, an Infallibility, before he be too earneſt, to be contented with nothing leſſe. For what if humane nature ſhould not be capable of ſo great a good, would he therefore think fitting to live without any Religion, becauſe he could not get ſuch a one as himſelfe deſired, though with more then a mans wiſh. Were it not rationall to ſee, whether amongſt Religions, ſome one hath not ſuch notable advantages over the reſt, as in reaſon it might ſeeme, humane nature might be contented withall Let him caſt his accompts with the deareſt things he hath, his own, or freinds lives, his eſtate, his hope of poſterity, and ſee upon what termes of advantage he is ready to venture all theſe, and then return

turne to Religion, and see whether, if he doe not venture his soule upon the like, it be truly reason, or some other not confessed motive, which withdraweth him. For my own part, as I doubt not of an Infallibity, so I doubt not, but setting that aside, there be those excellencies found on the Catholique party, which may force a man to preferre it, and venture all he hath upon it, before all other Religions, and Sects in the world: Why then may not one, who after long searching findeth no Infallibility, rest himselfe on the like, supposing mans nature affordeth no better?

Another thing may make a mans search faulty, and is carefully to be looked unto, I meane, that it is easie for a man to mistake himselfe, by too much confidence in himselfe or others. He that will make a judgement in an Art he is not Master in, if he be deceived, is to impute it unto himselfe. The Phrase commandeth us to beleeve every man in his Art; he who knoweth and understandeth himselfe, beleeveth not. Therefore when we see Masters in an Art, we are not skilled in, oppose us, we may beleeve we are in the wrong: which will bred this resolution in the Author of the discourse, that if himselfe be not skilled all those wayes in which he pursueth his search, he must find himselfe obliged to seek Masters, who be both well skilled, and (the matter being subject to faction) also very honest and upright men, or else he doth not quit himselfe before God and man.

I cannot part without one note more, which is, that it is not all one to incurre damnation for infidelity

delity, and to be in ſtate of Salvation. For the man to whom infidelity is not imputed, may be in ſtate of damnation, for other faults, as thoſe were who having known God by his works, did not glorifie him as they ought: nay, they may be damned through want of Faith, and yet not be condemned for incredulity. As for example ſake, if when they have ſinned, they know not what meanes to take to have them forgiven, though they be without fault in not beleeving, nevertheleſſe dying without remiſſion of ſinne, they are not in ſtate to come to life everlaſting. As the man, who ſhould venture into a Wood without a guide, although he did his beſt to have a guide, nothing leſſe might fall out of his way, as well as he, who neglected the taking of one; ſo if God ſent his Sonne to ſhew us the way of Salvation, and that be but one; as well is he like not to be ſaved, who never heard of ſuch a way, as he that heard of it, and neglected it; for neither of the two goeth that way; and who goes not on the way, is not like to come to the end. I know God is good and mercifull; but I know his workes, as far as we know, are diſpenſed by the order of ſecond cauſes; and where we ſee no ſecond cauſes, we cannot preſume of the effects. God is good and mercifull I know, and feedeth the Birds of the aire, and much more men; yet we ſee in dearths and hard winters, both men and Birds to periſh, doe they what they could to get victuals. And how am I aſſured he will ſend Angels to illuminate ſuch men as doe their endeavours, that their ſoules may not periſh? But

far

far more doe I doubt, whether ever man, who had not the way of Chriſt, or even of thoſe, who walked in it, did ever doe his beſt (except ſome few, and very few, perhaps not two of Chriſt his greateſt favourites) and was not ſo culpable, that his perdition would not have been imputed unto himſelfe. God of his mercy put us in the ſcore of thoſe, of whom he ſaith, *He will take pitty upon whom he pleaſeth, and compaßion of them he pleaſeth.*

FINIS.

THE LORD OF FAVLKLANDS REPLY.

SIR,

I Receive your intention to instruct me for a great Obligation, but I should have esteemed it a greater; if you would have pleased to let me know to whom I owe the Favour, and should pay my thanks; and if you had not translated the command of secresie from proper to metaphoricall Almes.

I am also to thank you (for in this Age we are beholding to them who doe what is fit) for not

mixing Gall with your Inke; since I have ever thought that there should bee as little bitterness in a Treatise of Controversie, as in a Love-letter, and that the contrary way was both void of Christian charitie, and humane wisedome, as serving onely πρὸς τὸ προσοβεῖν τὴν θήραν, to fright away the game, and make their Adversarie unwilling to receive Instruction from him, from whom they have received Injuries; and making themselves unabler to discover Truth (which Saint *Austine* sayes is hard for him to find who is calme, but impossible for him that is angry:) raising besides a great suspition of ignorance in him that useth it; since it is a very true Rule which we have received from *Hierocles*, μέγα συντελεῖ πρὸς πραότητα τὸ τῆς ἐπιστήμης θάρσος, Confidence of knowledge conduceth much to meeknesse: Now in this I intend to take you for my pattern, and the same Author for my Counsellour; καὶ δυναμενὸς ἀνατρέπειν τὰ ψεύδη, and being able to overthrow what is false (for so must I thinke I can, and such I must take your reasons to be, as long as they perswade me not) μητὲ σφοδρῶς μητε ὑβριστικῶς τοῦτο ποιήσω σὺν πραότητι τὴν διήθειαν διώκων, καὶ μετ' εὐμενῶν ἐλέγχων τὸ ψεῦδος ἀνατρέπων, οὐ συγχωρῶν οὕτως ἔχειν ὡς λέγεται ἀλλ' ἀοργήτως ἀκούων, resisting Errors without Anger, and pursuing Truth with mildnesse.

Synesius.

Now this I must professe for my selfe, that since I considered any thing in Religion, and knew that there were severall of them in the world, I never avoided to hear (at least) any man that was willing to perswade me by reason, that any of them

them was the true, μήτε πάντας λόγους καταδεχόμενον ἵνα μὴ τοῦ ψεύδους, μήτε πάντας ἀποβάλλων ἵνα μὴ τοῦ ἀληθοῦς. Nay rather I have laid wait to meet with such of all sorts, as were most likely to say most on their side (as S. *Chrysostome* sayes of *Abraham*, that he did σαγηνεύειν τοὺς ξένους lay nets for Guests) and though almost all that undertake the search of so important a Truth, doe it better, provided, with sharpnes of wit, and soliditie of judgement, yet I verily beleeve that few doe with that indifference and equalitie which is fit for a Judge, and with which I both began and continue it.

Yet (least there might some un-mark't prejudice lye lurking in me, and least I might harbour some secret inclination to those Tenets which I had first been taught) I have ever lean'd, and set my Byas to the other side, and have both more discoursed of matters of Religion with those of the Church of *Rome* then with their Adversaries, and read more of their writings; though none either so often or so carefully, as this which I am now answering, both because it was intended for my Instruction and confutation; as also because the beauty of the stile and language, in which you have apparrelled your conceptions (although

Ovid. Metamorph.

——— *Non hæc*
Auxilio tibi sunt Decor est quæsitus ab istis,

yet) showes the Author a considerable Person, and I may say of the splendour and outside of what you have said (for my opinion (that it wants soliditie, and that the Logick of it is inferiour to the Rhetorick) is seen by my writing against it) what

Tacitus sayes of *Vitellius* his Armie, *Phaleræ torquesque splendebant, & non Vitellio principe dignus exercitus*; for as he would have had that glorious Army been imployed in the defence of a better and braver Prince, so I wish your eloquence had guilded the better cause; καὶ εἰθ' ὦ λωστεσὸ τοιοῦτος ὢν φίλος ἡμῖν γένοιο. And (having learn't moreover from the Pagan Divinitie of *Hierocles* (which in this is conformable to that of most Christians) that ἔοικε τὸ, παρ' ἡμῶν σπουδαζόμενον ἐκτεινομένη χεῖρι πρὸς λῆψιν τῶν ἀγαθῶν; τοδὲ παρὰ θεοῦ συντελούμενον χορηγία εἶναι καὶ πηγὴ τῶν ἀγαθῶν: καὶ τὸ μὲν ἐκζητεῖν πεφυκέναι τὰ ἀγαθα, τοδὲ ἐκφαίνειν τῶν ζητοῦντι ὀρθῶς; ἡ δὲ εὐχὴ μθόριον εἶναι τῆστη παρ' ἡμῶν ζητήσεος, καὶ τῆς παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ δόσεως, that all our search is but the stretching forth of our hands, and that our finding proceeds from Gods delivering the Truth unto us, and that prayer is the best meanes to joyn the latter to the former:) I have not only with my utmost endeavours done my part; but also besought God with my most earnest fervency to doe his; and so ὡς εἶδος ἐπὶ ὅλῃ εὐχὴν τῷ ἔργῳ συνάπτων, joyning Prayer to search, like form to Matter; I doubt not but God who hath given me a will, to seek his Will, also τὰ ἡ αὐτοῦ γεωργεῖν σπέρματα; and if I have not the truth already, I shall be taught the truth by him, and by you as his Instrument, or shall be excused, if I find it not; assuring you that I was never more ready to part with my clothes when they were torn, then with my opinions when they were confuted, and appeared to me to be so.

Xenophon Hist. 3.

Euseb. Orat. de Laud. Const.

To begin then with your Treatise, you can say nothing for Tradition, which I will not willingly allow,

allow, Scripture it ſelf being a *Traditum*, and by that way comming to our knowledge, (for I am confident that thoſe who would know it by the Spirit, run themſelves into the ſame Circle between Scripture and Spirit, out of which ſome of your ſide have but unſucceſſefully laboured to get out between Scripture and Church) but that this way which you propound ſhould be convenient to know what was Tradition at firſt, I can by no means agree. Which to conſider the better, I will comprehend all the ſtrength of what you have ſaid in a little room, and ſhut up your Oration into the compaſſe of ſome 3. Sillogiſmes; thus you argue,

What company ſoever of Chriſtians alone pretend to teach nothing but what they have received from their Fathers, as received from theirs, as ſo come down from the Apoſtles, that company alone muſt hold the truth.

But that company of Chriſtians which are in communion with the Church of Rome *only pretend this,*

Therefore they alone hold the truth, and the Church.

The *Major* you prove thus:

If ſuch a company of Chriſtians could teach falſhoods, then (ſince it is granted that what was at firſt delivered was true) ſome age muſt either have erred in underſtanding their Anceſtors, or have joyned to deceive their poſterity.

But neither of theſe are beleevable,

Therefore neither is it beleevable, that ſuch a company of Chriſtians ſhould teach falſhoods.

The *Minor* you prove thus; (I mean that they alone

alone pretend it, for that they, I mean all they, pretend it, you take for granted.)

If it be incompatible with the Church of *Romes* doing it, that any else should doe it, then she does it alone.

But it is incompatible,(which is denied, and not yet proved.)

Therefore she doth it alone.

The severall parts of this Argument, I mean first to Answer; and secondly, Whatsoever lyes scatter'd in your discourse any thing to this purpose, or any other unanswer'd in the first part: and thirdly, I will reply to those Answers which you have been pleased to make, to part of that Nothing which I writ, wishing that this last work might have bin longer, I mean that by answering it all, and in order, you had given me occasion to have dwelt more upon my Reply.

Now if I doe not shew that all of the Church of *Rome* do not, nor cannot pretend this, that for two to pretend it is not incompatible (as having been so heretofore) that those who alone pretend this may pretend it falsely, that some men, and in time all may mistake their Ancestors, and have a mind in some cases to deceive their posterity, and that it is not necessary for a whole age at once to joyn in doing it, though it be done (if I say) I shew not this, then let me not bee beleeved, and if you can shew me that I have not shewed it, I will promise to beleeve you.

First, That the Church of *Rome* doth not, nor cannot pretend, that all their doctrine was received by

by them from their fathers as come down from the Apoſtles, it appeares, becauſe when queſtions have riſen about ſuch things, whereof there was before no ſpeech, yet if a Councell have determined them, they are received with the ſame aſſent, as if they had come from the Apoſtles; and they profeſſe now the ſame readineſſe to receive alwayes any ſuch definition, though about a queſtion now unknown; and it is likely, they have done what they profeſſe they are ready to doe; at leaſt, they ſhew, that yours is not the ground upon which they build. And I pray aske your ſelfe, whether thoſe that teach the common people (who are the greateſt part of your Church) uſe to be askt about it by them, or uſe to tell them, that this they received from their Fathers, as deſcended from the Apoſtles, by a continuall verball Tradition. For ſuppoſe they told them, that [this Tradition tels us] yet they are not able to diſtinguiſh between ſuch as is but Eccleſiaſticall, and Apoſtolicall, or whether this be known to them onely by deductions, or from ancient bookes, and no ſuch uncontinued line of teaching, and not rather perſwade them in generall to beleeve it, what by Arguments drawne from Scripture, what from reaſon, what from Fathers, Councels, or Decretals? I am not certaine what is their courſe, but I am ſure, the moſt ordinary amongſt the Ancients (whom they pretend to follow) was, that when they had told the people, that ſuch a propoſition was true, they added [neither is it I that ſay ſo, but the Apoſtle, the Prophet, or

the Evangeliſt] and mentioned the place, where they thought ſuch a doctrine was included, ſeldome ſpeak of any verball Tradition (leſſe of ſuch a one, upon which you wholly rely) except urg'd to it, when that was impudently claim'd by ſome Heretique; and when they did (as the *Aſian* Biſhops about *Eaſter*, *Juſtin Martir* about the age of Chriſt, Saint *Auſtine* about communicating Infants, *Papius* and *Iræneus* about the doctrine of the *Chiliaſts*) then (as *Lucian* tels us, that when that Jugler *Alexander* ſent to a City a Verſe to be ſet upon their doores to keepe away the Plague, thoſe houſes which uſed the remedy, were more viſited then thoſe that did not ſo) thoſe doctrines which the Fathers did grace by writing verball Tradition in their foreheads, were not leſſe (perhaps more) apt to be after diſbeleeved, then the other which were not in that kind taught.

Now if the Ighorant be not expreſly inſtructed, that upon this ground they are to think that true, which they are bid to beleeve (eſpecially where their religion is eaſily enough received, onely for being that of their Country) you muſt allow, that the greateſt part of your Church cannot, nor does not pretend, to have received all they beleeve under that Notion; and to know they did, you muſt have ſpoke with them all, or have heard them all inſtructed; for what is in ſome places ſo taught, may be delivered upon other grounds in the very next Pariſhes.

From the Ignorant let us come to the learned, and

and ſee whether they doe not both beleeve more, and require more to be beleeved, then hath had any ſuch pedigree as you imagine. Firſt, then the great, eloquent, and judicious Cardinall *Perron*, (whom I preferre ſo much before all thoſe of his ſide that have been Authors, that [if a Pigmy may be allowed to meaſure Giants] I ſhould think that the vaſt learning and induſtry of *Bellarmine*, and *Baronius*, might with moſt advantage to their party, and no diſgrace to them, have been employ'd in ſeeking quotations for his large and monſtrous underſtanding to have employ'd them) he, I ſay, tels us, (and not from himſelfe, but from Saint *Auſtine*) that the Trinity, Pennance, Free-will, and the Church, were never exactly diſputed of, before the *Arrians*, the *Novatians*, the *Pelagians*, and the *Donatiſts*. Now (ſince without doubt the former ages diſputed as well as they could, and ſo could not inſtruct their Proſelites, better then they confuted their Adverſaries) I think it evident, that more hath ſince been concluded, then came from Tradition, and that the way you ſpeak of, appeared not ſufficient, either to Cardinall *Perron*, or Saint *Auſtin*. But becauſe *Bellarmine* (being written in a more generall language) is more generally (though, I thinke unjuſtly) eſteemed then *Perron*, I will aske you a queſtion of him, when he excuſeth Pope *John* the 22th. for denying, that Saints enjoy the beatificall viſion before the day of judgement (in which he was lead by a Troop of Fathers) becauſe the Church had not then de-

fined the contrary; did *Bellarmine* beleeve, that then Christians had received from their Fathers, as from the Apostles, a direct contrary Tradition to his doctrine? If he did, how could he think the Pope, either possibly to be ignorant of it, or excuseable, if he stood against it? If not, then he thought our Age beholding to our Fathers, for finding out some truths, which had no such line to come down by; nay, which the Apostles either taught not, or but obscurely, and so as needs Arguments to deduce it out of their writings; at least, not so generally, but that a Pope, and many more chiefe Doctors of the Church, knew not they had done so, (although you often put us in minde, that *Tertullian* tels us, how in that Church which he governed, the Apostles poured out all their doctrines with their blood) and in his time, Fathers taught not their children so: And this objection lyes against you, as often as any of your side confesse any of the Ancients (accompted Orthodox) to have delivered any doctrine, contrary to that of the now Church of *Rome*, which many of them often confesse, and your selfe doe not deny: for that they could not have done, if an uninterrupted verball Tradition had been then the onely rule of true doctrine, and they had known it to be so (for then they had a way of information, which you must confesse easie, since they might soon have known, whether generally, Christians had been taught the contrary, under such a Notion, and in such a degree, as you speak of) or the Church of *Rome* had not since, either deviated

deviated from the tradition of one part, or introduced on the other.

But becauſe you knew, that the claime of Tradition could not ſerve your Churches turne, if any other different from yours made the ſame; you therefore affirme, that none doth, and prove it, becauſe two cannot doe it; and in this you muſt give me leave to ſay, that you imitate the Philoſopher, who made Arguments againſt Motion, though one walked before him; for though we ſee that the *Greek* Church does it as much as the *Romane*, (though apt to be deceived in the doing it, by the ſame wayes) yet you hope to perſwade us beyond our eyes, by a reaſon, which indeed ends in an aſſertion: for, I pray, why may not two companies of Chriſtians, both pretend to ſuch a Tradition, (though oppoſing each other) as well as the *Aſian* Churches and the *Roman* did long together, about the celebration of *Eaſter*? But not onely that it may be ſo, but that it is ſo, you may find by *Hieremy*, *Nilus*, and *Barlaam* (who profeſſe to ſtand to the Scriptures, the ancient Tradition of their Fathers, and the ſeven firſt generall Councels, and they can be diſprov'd no way, but by the ſame you may be ſo too) over and above the confeſſions of your own men.

But ſuppoſe you did pretend, and alone pretend to ſuch a Tradition, yet you might falſely doe it: for I deſire you to remember, that the Apoſtles delivered, as well Writings as verball Doctrine; and whatſoever the firſt ages thought

to be contained there, that they might as well deliver to their posterity, as taught them by the Apostles, as what they received by word of mouth; since we use to say, I learnt this of such a man, when we mean from his book, and though you strive to joyne verball Tradition in commission with Scripture, yet sure none of you can desire to thrust Scripture out quite from being at least a part of the Rule. Now that they might erre in interpreting their writings (and an error in the cheifest then, might easily cause a generall one since) I think you will not deny, especially since to say, that they left by Tradition every place of Scripture interpreted, would be an evidently false assertion: for how could the Fathers then have written upon it such differently-expounding Comments.

Secondly, How shall it appeare, that there were not once two contrary Traditions claimed by two Parts (as the *Asian* Church, and the *Roman*, whereof, both it seemes claim'd a direct verball Tradition, because one pretended to have received theirs from Saint *John*, and the other, from Saint *Peter*; whereof there is no word in their workes) and that the erring Part did not prevaile? We know, out of the fifth of *Eusebius* History, that the fore-runners laid claime to Tradition, and nam'd the very Pope, that had chang'd the doctrine at *Rome*; which claime (how impudently soever) yet shewes, that men might joyne to deceive their Posterity, as pretending to a Tradition, when there was no such; for, if

you

you ſay thoſe were but few, I anſwer, both that you are not certaine of their number, and ſince ſo many may joyn, I pray, what number is it cannot?

Thirdly, Since you muſt and doe confeſſe, that ſome Doctrines, which were not once generally witneſſed to have been delivered by the Apoſtles, are now Doctrines of Faith (as the Epiſtle to the *Hebrewes* was rejected by the *Roman* Church in Saint *Hierom*'s time, though to her yee uſe to ſay, that *Irœneus* would have every Church agree, and though Saint *Hierom*, whom you would prove to have thought *Damaſus* infallible, when it is known, that he thought *Libertius* a Heretick, received it for all that) becauſe you ſay, that theſe doctrines had ſo much Tradition as was *exceptione major*, beyond exception, (though the Church of *Rome* thought not ſo then;) doth not this reſt upon the Logick of thoſe Ages, to conclude what Teſtimony is ſo? which might eaſily deceive them, eſpecially ſince you confeſſe alſo, that particular Traditions may be falſe (as you inſtance in the *Chiliaſts*) and yet the ſame reaſon, which perſwaded ſome to receive them, may perſwade more and more in ſeverall times (and ſo no age need to joyne, as you ſuppoſe) and ſo a falſe Tradition may grow a generall one; as it ſeemes that of the *Chiliaſts* (if it be one) did, ſo generall, that *Juſtin Martyr* ſayes, in his time all Orthodox Chriſtians held it.

Beſides, in thoſe things which were beleeved very convenient, and which yet it was fear'd, that unleſſe

unlesse men thought them necessary, they would be backward to practise, in respect of the contrariety of them to their dispositions, (as confession) how easie was it for them to be after taught, under paine of more danger, then at first they were delivered with? as Physitians often tell their Patients, unlesse they take such a Potion, from which they are very averse, they must unavoidably die, though the not taking of it (even in their own opinions) would but make them lesse likely to recover. Some of great authority (moved by a good meaning) might thus deceive others; these, thus deceived, might deceive others; till, being generally spread, other good men, being loath to oppose them for the same reason, for which others desir'd to spread them, (as we saw *Erasmus*, who beleeved your confession, not to have been instituted by the Apostles, yet would not reprehend them that said so, thinking it an error, that would increase Piety) they be at last taken to have been commanded by the Apostles, without contradiction.

Indeed all the waies, by which I shewd in that paper, which you vouchsafed to answer (which I desire not to repeat, to avoid both your being wearied, and my own, ἐχθρόντε μοὶ ἔστιν ἄυθις ἀριζηλῶς εἰρημένα μυθολογεύειν,) that errors might come to be generall; all those are waies, by which the same errors might come to be thought to have proceeded from Tradition. Saint *Austin*, and *Tertullian*, agreeing in the sence of the sentence, which we read in the latter, * *Si legem nusquam reperio,*

* De Coronâ.

reperio, ſequitur ut Traditio conſuetudini morem hunc dederit, habiturum quandoque apoſtoli authoritatem ex interpretatione rationis; and it is the more ſtrange, that *Tertullian* ſhould allow any cuſtome the authority of comming from the Apoſtles, ſince in the ſame place, he gives any man leave to beginne a cuſtome, ſo it be good (which depends upon his reaſon, as the reception of it does upon theirs that follow him) and ſo make it a cuſtome, in theſe words. *Annon putas licere omni fideli concipere, & conſtituere, duntaxat, quod Deo congruat, quod diſciplinæ conducat, quod ſaluti proficiat, dicente Domino cur non & vobis ipſis quod juſtum eſt judicatis?* By which it ſeemes, he was willing, more ſhould be beleev'd then was firſt taught, and when that way had brought in any thing (for there is the ſame reaſon of opinion, as of actions) and made it common, then the former Rule ſerves to rivet it in, under the falſe Notion of comming from the Apoſtles, or having at leaſt equall authority, neither can you except againſt this, as ſaid by him when he was a Montaniſt, ſince your ſide uſeth to brag of this, and the like places, as making for them.

To explaine my meaning the fuller, give me leave to conſider one queſtion, which ſhall be, the immaculate conception of the Bleſſed Virgin: In the firſt ages it is a thing granted, that many Fathers beleeved her, not onely not free from Originall ſinne, but not even from Actuall; after this ſecond queſtion came to be more conſidered, and this firſt to be defin'd; but yet thoſe of the

Wadd. Pag. 271

Affirmative opinion, cannot but grant to thoſe of the Negative, that many Fathers ſided with them (or elſe they were impudent Quoters, who claim three hundred) nay, even in Saint *Thomas* his time, they confeſſe, that the Negative opinion was the more common doctrine; and yet ſee I pray, how things are altered? We have now a Hiſtory of ſome Treaties, of two Kings of *Spaine* with two Popes, by two Embaſſadours to perſwade them to define the Affirmative. The Hiſtory is written by one *Wadding* an *Iriſh-man*, his Secretary, there I find, that the Biſhop of *Carthage*, (having Order from the Embaſſadour his Maſter to deſire to preſſe, nay almoſt to tear a Definition from his Holineſſe about it) tells him (and not falſely) that thoſe who hold the Negative are, *Inter Catholicos ſoli & pauci unius inſtituti viri, & unus & alter ab illis edocti*, but a few of one onely Order, and one or two of their Diſciples. His Maſter bids him urge for the contrary: The opinion and ſubſcription of ſo many Prelates Orders, and Univerſities, the univerſall acclamation of the People, the weighty neceſſity of cutting off ſcandals; nay, ſaith he, many Univerſities ſuffer none to take Degrees without making a Vow for the Defence of the Immaculate conception; and for the Oppugners, *Conſtat eos ſentire aliter, quàm univerſa docet Eccleſia*, they differ from the Doctrine of the Univerſall Church: If then an opinion for which nothing is to be ſaid out of Antiquitie, and much againſt it, which was even lately, the leſſe common opinion, could grow to be

Wadding p. 124.

Page 97.

Page 90.

Page 400.

Page 57.

be held by so great a multitude in so high a degree, in so short a time, that the much greater part of the Church should now presse to have it defin'd, and that so earnestly, that to remove the opposing Fathers out of the way, they make a confession very advantagious to us Hereticks, that many things have been defin'd by their Church against many Fathers, you may easily see that Opinions may grow very generall, nay grow to claim Tradition in one Age that were unknown in another; for that they claim and prove only because of the the general reception in all Apostolicall Churches, not of any such uninterrupted testimony of Fathers to their Children, that so it hath been taught in all Ages.

Page 127.

Page 275.

You may see then that all your Church goes not upon your grounds, since if they did so, many of it that stand for the Affirmative must pretend to them, and if they doe, then sure the Pope must have confessed them to be witnesses beyond exception, and would accordingly have defin'd, if they doe not, then this certain way of yours, cannot keep false opinions out of a Church, which makes not that their Rule.

You may also see that opinions first unknown, after but particular, may come not onely to be generall, and to have Tradition claim'd for them, but even to be defin'd; since if a Generall Councell should now meet about this point, it is plain (without Gods immediate working to the contrary, of which you speak not) which would be defined, nay, I am confident, that as it is observed of the

Romans that they were twice as long in first conquering *Italy*, as (after) all the world; and as my Lord *Bacon* tels us of one, who was wont to say, *That he had first with much paines gotten a little estate, and after with little a great one*; so it is a much more short, and easie work to bring this to a Definition, then it was before to bring it thus far on the way towards one.

Which if it were brought (it being already almost defined, and ready to topple into a Doctrine necessary to salvation, the contrary being forbidden to be either printed or publikely taught) then (if you forsake not your Religion) you must forsake the Principle, and joyn with *Turnball*, who tells us, That the Churches supreme definition of matters of Faith is the infallible word of God, and together with the ancient Revelation made to the Prophets and Apostles makes up one Object, which is to be held by the Catholike Faith: By which it is plain, he thinks more may be reveal'd (and then must be held) then was to the Apostles and (by consequence) could be delivered by them, which is contrary to what you now say.

And indeed the current of Writers of your own side either knew not this opinion and Argument of yours, or consideringly balk it; else they might save themselves and their Readers the labour of writing, and reading such infinite Quotations: for though they speak often of Tradition, yet they thinke themselves bound to prove it better then by the pretence of your present Church; they pretend to receive it from the Ancient Writers

ters, (not, ſay they, that Verball Tradition hath in all Ages been taught to all men, to teach it their children, and that it never ſlept,) and you are the firſt whom I have met with, who build upon this; Indeed they know the Greeks have as much claim to ſuch a one (in truth to any) as they, and if they ſhould ſay with you, that it is incompatible for two to have it, the Greeks may as well argue upon thoſe grounds, that the *Romans* claim it not, becauſe they doe, as the *Romans* can, that the *Greeks* lay no claim to it, becauſe their Church does. And indeed direct experience ſhewes that this is not, nor hath alwayes been the ground of Chriſtians, that it is not (even amongſt you) we ſee by thoſe multitudes who cry out to have a Doctrine defined; which is ſo far from having any Tradition, (much leſſe your kind of one for it,) that they labour with little ſucceſſe to ſhew that there is none againſt them, and make it plainly appear, that upon your grounds they build not, but prove out of Metaphoricall places of Scripture, ſome at moſt but probable reaſons, and the Revelations of S. *Bridget*, which are contradicted by thoſe of Saint *Katharine*, (ſo ill do your Saints agree in heaven, that me thinks, we may bee forgiven, if we have ſome differences upon earth:) That this hath not been alwaies the way, we ſee by the exam- of *Origen*, who having been eſteemed by all Chriſtians, as almoſt a Prophet, no man in his time diſcovering that he taught contrary to what their Fathers had taught them, was yet condemned many yeers after his deceaſe, and his followers counted

Wadding P. 334.

Vincent Lir.

counted Hereticks, by the name of *Originiſtæ*, which had been impoſſible, if the following Ages had thought Tradition the onely fit Rule to judge by, and accompted nothing Tradition, but what they received from their Fathers in expreſſe termes: But if the opinions of Doctors, counted the Gnomons and Canons of Truth (for to that purpoſe ſpeakes *NaZianZene* of *Athanaſius*, and Saint *Auſtine* of *NaZianZene*, and Pope *Pius* the fifth of Saint *Thomas*, calling his doctrine, the certaineſt rule of Chriſtian religion, a title deny'd to Scripture) the definitions of Councels counted the higheſt Tribunals upon earth, aſſiſted by the power of Emperours, which might doe much, when almoſt all were under one (as may be ſeen by the multitude which followed *Conſtantine*, to Chriſtianity, and *Julian* from it, and by *Conſtantius* (as is complain'd) ἐν ὁρθαλμῷ ἐστῇ in the twinckling of an eye, transforming an *Orthodox* world into an *Arrian*) if theſe waies, I ſay, might make a Tenet generall, though no Tradition had come down at all concerning it; and after it pleaſe to claim by a Tenure, by which it came not in at firſt, encouraged by ſome Rule of ſome Fathers to that purpoſe (as ſome *Frenchmen* ſay of Cardinall *Richelieu*, that ſince he had that title, he claimes to have come from better Anceſtours then he aimed at, being an ordinary Perſon; and *Harry* the ſeventh, though he came to the Crown by his Wives right, yet would hold it by his own) and none after oppoſe that claime, ſome not doing it, becauſe they thinke the opinion true, and then

Wadd. Pag. 282

care

care not though it be beleev'd upon false inducements, ſome as being ignorant that ever it was leſſe generall (which before the late and happy reſurrection of learning, the beſt read Perſons of their time might often be) how deceiving a way is yours, to diſcover what all ages have thought, by what now a part of the preſent teacheth, upon what pretence ſoever, which when you have conſidered, and not onelie that, what I have ſaid may be, but by ſeverall examples (whereof I will touch ſome) that ſo it is, and hath been, then I hope you will be ſo farre from expecting that I ſhould be moved by your Arguments, that your ſelfe will wonder that ever you were.

Firſt then, that the *Chiliaſts* are Hereticks, or your Church not infallible, which counts them ſo, is moſt certaine, and moſt plaine; and if you be in the right, and that ſhe teacheth nothing, but what ſhe hath received uninterruptedly downe from the Apoſtles, then they muſt alwaies have been eſteemed ſo by Chriſtians; whereas their doctrine is ſo farre from having any Tradition againſt it, that if anie opinion, whether controverted, or uncontroverted (except that Scripture which never was doubted) may without bluſhing pretend to have that for it, it muſt be this of theirs. My Reaſons are theſe:

The Fathers of the pureſt Ages (who were the Apoſtles Diſciples but once remov'd) did teach this, as receiv'd from them, who profeſſed to have receiv'd it from the Apoſtles, and who ſeem'd to them witneſſes beyond exception, that they

they had done ſo, they being better Judges what credit they deſerv'd, then after commers could poſſibly be.

All other opinions, witneſſed by any other Ancients to have Tradition, may have been by them miſtaken to have been, ſo, out of Saint *Auſtin*'s and *Tertullian*'s rules: whereas for this, and for this alone, are delivered the very words, which Chriſt us'd when he taught it.

Of the moſt glorious and leaſt infirme building, which ever in my opinion was erected to the honour of the Church of *Rome*, Cardinall *Perron* was the Architect (I mean his book againſt King *James*) and that relies upon theſe two pillars, that whatſoever all the Fathers (he meanes, ſure, that are extant) witneſſe to be Tradition, and the doctrine of the Church, that muſt be receiv'd for the doctrine of thoſe ages, and ſo reſted upon: If theſe rules be not concluding, then the whole book being built upon them, neceſſarily becomes as unconſiderable for what he intended it, as *Bevis* or *Tom Thumb*: If they be, then this doctrine, which is now hereticall in your Churches beleife was the opinion of the Ancient Church. For if being taught by the Fathers of anie Age, none contradicting it, be ſufficient, this all for above two Ages (and thoſe the firſt) teach, not anie Father oppoſing it before *Dionyſius Alexandrinus* (250. yeares after Chriſt at leaſt) that we know, or Saint *Hierome*, or Saint *Auſtine* knew and quoted: wherein I note, beſides, that both theſe Fathers, either thought that no ſigne of the opinion

opinion of the Church, or cared not though it were.

And if Fathers ſpeaking as witneſſes will ſerve, let *Pappias* and *Irenæus* be heard, and believ'd, who tels us it came to them from Chriſt by Verball Tradition, and *Juſtine Martir*, who witneſſeth that in his time all Orthodoxe Chriſtians held it, and joynes the oppoſers with them who denied the Reſurrection, and eſteemes them among the Chriſtians like the *Sadduces* among the *Jewes*: which proves that you have the ſame reaſon *expalleſcere audito Eccleſiæ nomine*, to grow pale at the mention of the Ancient Church, (the neareſt to the Apoſtles) as we have to ſtart at that of two hundred years agoe, and to be aſham'd of your *Dionyſius Alexandrinus*, as wee of *Luther*: Thus that great *Atlas* of your Church hath helpt us to pull it down the ſame waies, by which he intended to ſupport it, and though he have beſt of any undergone the burden of proving that to be infallible, which is falſe, yet he muſt have confeſt, that either theſe are not prooſes, or they prove againſt himſelf. And this advantage we have, that unleſſe you prove your own infallibility (which you will never be able to do) in what point ſoever you confute us, that falls like a Pinacle without carrying all after it; whereas if we diſprove any one of your Religion, we diſprove conſequently that infallibility, which is the foundation of it all: ſo that (like them who vſe poiſon'd weapons) whereſoever we wound, we kill, but we are like thoſe creatures, which muſt be killed all over, or *Camp.*

elſe their other parts will remaine alive.

Neither muſt you think that you have anſwer'd the *Chillaſts* by tying them to the *Carpocratians* and the *Gnoſticks*, (which is but like *Mezentius* his joyning *Mortua corpora vivis*, dead bodies to the living) ſince the opinions of the two latter, aſſoon as they were taught, made the teachers accounted Hereticks and were oppos'd by allmoſt all, whereas that of the firſt, found in above two ages, no reſiſtance by any one known and eſteemed Perſon, and the teachers of it were not onely parts, but principall ones of the Catholique Church, and ſuch as ever have been, and are reputed Saints; though, by I know not what ſubtlety you diſpence with your ſelves for departing from what doctrine was received from them as come down from the Apoſtles, and yet threaten us with damnation if we will not believe more improbable Tenets to be Tradition upon leſſe Certificate. For as *Ariſtotle* ſaith τὰ οἴνηρα μετρὰ ὁ μὲν ὠνοῦνται μείζω, ὁ δὲ πωλοῦσιν ἐλάττω, Wine meaſures to buy with are great, and to ſell by are ſmall; ſo when you are to put a doctrine to us, how ſmall a meaſure of Tradition would you have us take? one place of one Father, ſpeaking but as a Doctor, ſeemes enough: but when you are to receive any from us, how large and mighty a meaſure will yet give you no ſatisfaction? Neither can I find out what it is by which you conclude, that their Tradition was gathered the Hereticall way from private diſcourſe with the Apoſtles: *Irenæus* indeed tells us, that *Presbyteri meminerunt*, one of which *Pappias* was, but not a word that it

Ethicks.

was

was deliver'd in ſecret, or the auditors but few, nor that others had not heard other diſciples teaching the ſame doctrine; and me thinkes that if you had evinced what you deſire (as you ſeem to me not to do, unleſſe to affirm be to prove) it would make more againſt you; ſure if from ſo ſmall a ground as the word of one onely diſciple, that he in private diſcourſe was taught this by the Apoſtles, a falſe doctrine could ſo generally be received by all the firſt Doctors of the Chriſtian Church, and that ſo long after *Dionyſius Alexandrinus* had uſed his great Authority to deſtroy it: Saint *Hierome* was yet halfe afraid to write againſt it, as ſeeing how many Catholiques he ſhould enrage againſt himſelfe by it, as he teſtifies in his Proem to the eighteenth Book of his Comment upon *Iſaiah*; what ſuſpitions muſt this raiſe in the mindes of thoſe of your own party, leaſt what they eſteemed Tradition, had at firſt no greater a beginning, and no firmer foundation, but onely better fortune; for why might not the ſame diſciple have cozn'd them from whom their beliefe is deſcended in twenty other things, as well as in this? and why not twenty others as well as he? eſpecially ſince you confeſſe ſome of your doctrine not to have had Vniverſall Tradition, but onely Tradition enough; which if thoſe Fathers did not think they had had, for this, they would never have receiv'd it, but have excepted againſt the Hereticall way of their delivery, if they had known that to be a private one, and a private one to be ſuch, and if they were ſo deceived in this way, might not they,

and more have been ſo too in other points, and in time all?

If you ſay (as it hath been ſaid to me by one whoſe judgment I value, as much as any one of your Party) that if this opinion had indeed had Tradition, it could never have been ſo totally extinguiſh'd. I anſwer, that I affirm not, that it had, but onely that if the rules of your part be good and valid, then it had; I am ſure it hath better colour to plead upon, then any of thoſe other doctrines, which you impoſe upon us: Beſides although it had, yet when Doctors of great authority with the people, had won upon many, firſt not to think it Tradition, and then not true, and laſtly their courage encreaſing with their multitude, (for Saint *Hierome* durſt not call it) had made it accounted an Hereſie, it is not ſtrange that none ſhould riſe to oppoſe it; for by that time burning was come in faſhion, which was a ready way to anſwer all objections, and end all controverſies, eſpeciall Piety being grown more cold, and ſo men leſſe apt to ſuffer for opinions, and the times more ignorant, and ſo men leſſe able to examine what had been beleeved before them. But you who affirm, that your Church receives nothing, but what hath come to her by Verball Tradition down from the Apoſtles, muſt not onely deſtroy the Arguments, which prove this to have had Tradition, (which you, or any elſe will be never able to do) but muſt affirm, that the contrary hath ſuch, which yet their moſt ancient oppoſers never pretended too, but

ſcoft

ſcoft at the opinion as rediculous and ſavouring of *Judaiſme*, which as wiſe men, and as good Chriſtians, as they, before them beleeved to be Orthodox.

Let us next conſider that controverſie which more afflicted the Church, and for a longer time then any other, that between the *Arrians* and their Adverſaries, and let us ſee, whether even againſt thoſe there were any ſuch Tradition as you ſpeak of. Firſt then I pray mark what Cardinal *Perron* confeſſeth, that an *Arrian* will be deſirous to have his cauſe tried by thoſe Authors we now have, which lived before the Queſtion aroſe; for there, ſaith he, will be found the Son is the inſtrument of his Father, The Father commanded the Son, when things were to be made, the Father and the Son are *aliud & aliud*, which who ſhould at this day ſay, now the language of the Church is better examin'd, would be accompted an *Arrian*. Now though there be no reaſon for you to disbelieve ſo learned a Prelate in a matter of Fact (eſpecially ſince ὅικοθεν ὁ μαρτὺς) yet if you pleaſe to reconſider thoſe Authors ſeriouſly, if you have not mark't it before (as Præjudication blinds extreamly) you will then confeſſe it; Sure then if Fathers in the firſt ages taught their Children, that ſo they had receiv'd from theirs, as the doctrine of the Apoſtles, how could the chiefe Pillars of Chriſtianity have been ignorant of it? or if they knew it, how would they ever have written ſo directly againſt their knowledge. For that anſwer which Saint *Hierome* gives (as Saint *Auſtine* to the *Pelagians*

Lib. Con. R. Fac. Pag. 633.

gians) that before *Arrius* aroſe, the Eccleſiaſticall Writers ſpoke *minùs cautè*, with leſſe circumſpection, though it brings ſome ſalve to the preſent objection, yet it is a weapon againſt Tradition in generall, for if through want of care the beſt and wiſeſt men vs'd to contradict Tradition, (as you muſt grant they did) then ſure much more likely, when they taught by word of mouth, when leſſe care is alwaies us'd, then in Bookes, and how then can any age be ſure, that by this reaſon (of *minùs cautè loquuti ſunt*) their Anceſtors have not miſtaken their Fathers, and miſlead their Poſterity? Look but into *Athanaſius*, and ſee but what he anſwers to what is brought againſt him out of *Dionyſius Alexandrinus*, truly in my opinion when he ſtrives to make it Catholique Doctrine, he doth it with no leſſe pulling, and halling, then *Sancta Clara* uſeth to agree the articles of the Engliſh Church with the Tenets of the Roman. Conſider what eighty Biſhops, and thoſe Orthodoxe, decreed againſt *Paulus Samoſatenus*, and if you make it conſent with *Athanaſius* his Creed, I ſhall believe that you have diſcouer'd a way how to reconcile both Parts of a Contradiction: This I ſay, not as intending by it to prove the *Arrian* opinion to be true, but that the contrary Party inſiſted not upon your grounds, but drew their beliefe out of Scripture, for if there had been ſuch a common and conſtant Verball Tradition, the chiefe Chriſtians would not through want of Caution have contradicted it, neither could *Conſtantine*, if it had been then as known a Part of the Chriſtian Religion,

Religion, as Christ's Resurrection, have ever so slightly esteemed the Question, when it first arose, neither would *Alexander* the Bishop of *Alexandria* have remain'd any while in suspence, as *Zozomen* saith he did, πῄ μὲν τοῦτο τὴν δὲ ἐκείνους ἐπαινῶν; but this being then a Question newly started and spoken of before but by Accidents, and so peradventure *minùs cautè*, (for the same Author saies, that they did ἄγειν εἰς ζήτησιν τὰ πρότερον ἀνεξέταστα) they were therefore faine to try it by Scripture, (esteeming Written Tradition, as sufficient a Rule, as Verball) as you may see by *Constantine*'s own words at the Councel of *Nice*, εὐαγγέλικαι βίβλοι καὶ ἀποστόλικαι καὶ τῶν παλαιῶν προφετῶν τὰ θεσπίσματα σαφῶς ἡμᾶς, πῶς χρὴ περὶ τοῦ θείου φρονεῖν, ἐκπαιδεύουσι, ἐκ τῶν θεοπνευστῶν οὖν λόγων λάβωμεν τῶν ζητουμένων τὴν λύσιν. The Bookes of the Evangelists, and the Apostles, and the Oracles of the Ancient Prophets teach us clearly what we are to think of the Divinity. Let us therefore cut of these Divinity-inspir'd discourses, seek the solutions of our Questions, which being the Emperours Proposition, and passing uncontradicted (which the Bishops would not have suffr'd it to do, if they had known yours to be so much the best, and most certaine way, and this so hazardous as you suppose) we have reason to believe that they for want of your direction made the Scripture their Rule, and sought out for Truth by the same way, that we damnable Hereticks do, and by that condemn'd the *Arrians*, as not having such a Tradition as you speak of, (or if they had, which is very unlikely) counting it so insufficient; as that they were

Theodoret.

were not to conclude by that. Neither did onely that ancient, (and not yours) Councell, but even your own Modern ones shew, that they went upon other grounds, since to have had every Bishop askt what he receiv'd from his Teachers, as receiv'd from theirs, as come downe from the Apostles, would sure have been the shortest way to find Truth, and if they had thought it the best too, it would have sav'd the Friers at Trent many a long dispute out of Scripture, Fathers, and Reason, and the Bishops many a weary session before any thing could be determined, or the Parties brought to agree. Besides there is another reason (if I may be pardon'd a little insisting upon my digression) which perswades me that your own Councels define not upon your grounds (that is) because suppose a thousand Catholique Bishops meet and define any thing, yet wee know it is not among you believ'd *de Fide*, without it be confirmed by the Pope; which shewes plainly enough, that you think not they went by such a Tradition, since of that eighty, so many persons from so many several Parts are witnesses beyond exception, according to your own grounds, and that their Infallibility is not thought to depend upon an Impossibility; that (in the matter of Fact what hath been taught under that Notion) they should either deceive, or be deceiv'd, but upon an infallible assistance of the Holy Ghost, which may be wanting to any company, whereof the Pope is no part, or of whose decrees he is no confirmer. Now to return to my proofes, that against the *Arrians* there was no such

Tradition

Tradition as you ſpeak of, (at leaſt, that was the ground upon which they were condemned) conſider, if you pleaſe, that in that Epiſtle which *Euſebius* of *Cæſarea* writ to ſome *Arrians* after the Councell of *Nice*, he ſaith, Firſt, that they aſſented to the word ὁμοούσιον, Conſubſtantiall, becauſe alſo they knew τῶν παλαιῶν λογίους τινὰς καὶ ἐπιφανεῖς ἐπισκόπους, καὶ συγγραφέας, ſome eloquent and illuſtrious Biſhops and Writers had us'd the Terme: In which I note, that neither claim'd he any ſuch Verbal Tradition for this as you ſpeak of, and of that ſort which he claim'd, he names onely τινὰς ſome, as knowing too many had writ otherwiſe to give ſuch a Tradition leave to be generall.

Secondly, He ſaith, they conſented to Anathematize the Contradictors, διὰ τὸ ἀπαίρειν ἀγράφους χρῆσθαι φωνάς, to hinder men from uſing unwritten words, by which he ſaith (and that truely) that all confuſion hath come upon the Church. And if it be askt why the ſame reaſon made them not keep out the word ὁμοούσιον, I anſwer, That I believe (or elſe he is not conſtant to his own reaſon) that he meant onely thoſe words to be unwritten, which were in Scripture, neither themſelves, nor equivalently, whereas he took ὁμοούσιον to be in the Scripture in the latter ſence: And that by written, he meant in the Scripture onely, appeares by what followes, that no divinely-inſpired writing (μηδεμίαν θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς) uſing the *Arrians* Phraſe, it was neither fitting to ſay nor teach them: Neither can you ſay that *Euſebius* being himſelf a ſecret *Arrian* prevaricated herein,

for *Theodoret* makes this Epiſtle an Argument againſt them, which he would not have done, if either it had ſeem'd to him to ſay any thing contrary to the Catholique doctrine, or not to have oppos'd the contrary by a Catholique way, at leaſt without giving his leader ſome Caution concerning it.

All which reaſons move me to think, that the generality of Chriſtians had not been alwaies taught the contrary to *Arrius*'s doctrine, but ſome one way, others the other, moſt neither, as having been onely ſpoken of upon occaſions, and therefore me thinks you had better either ſay with the Proteſtants, that the Truth was concluded (as *Conſtantine* ſaid it ſhould be) by Arguments from Scripture, or (as ſome of your own ſay of other points) that before the Councell it lay in *Archivis Eccleſiæ*, in the Deskes of the Church, then claime ſuch a Tradition for it, as appeares it can never be defended that it had.

Let us conſider but two opinions more:

That Infants are not to receive the Euchariſt, is now both the doctrine and practiſe of the *Roman* Church, but ſix hundred yeeres the Church us'd it; Saint *Auſtine* accounted it neceſſary at leaſt in ſome ſence of the word, if not abſolutely (which laſt is moſt likely, becauſe from the neceſſity of that, which could not be receiv'd but by them who had received Baptiſme, he, and *Innocentius* a Pope, prove the neceſſity of Baptiſme) and an Apoſtolicall Tradition. If

there-

therefore both these Ages had gone by your Rule, how comes this difference between their opinions, the Sacrament being the same it was, and the Children the same they were?

This I may consider, and see if the same way that this Doctrine hath been altered, whether any other might not have received change?

Next, that Saints are invocable, you must say, is Tradition taught from Father to Sonne, as deriv'd from the Apostles, if you will be constant to your own principle, now though I might disprove this, first by the many Fathers that beleeved, the *Just* not to be admitted to the Beatificall vision before the day of judgement (for upon this your side now grounds that) but to be kept in secret receptacles, and by the long time which pass'd before this doctrine was condemn'd: Secondly, by the beginning of it, which was particular Doctors Hipotheticall prayers, with εἰτὶς αἴσθησις, and such conditionall clauses: And thirdly, by *Nicephorus Calistus* his Relation (who in this is a believable witnesse, because he allowes of your opinion) that prayers to the Virgin *Mary* were first brought into the publick Liturgie by one *Petrus Gnapheus* a Heretick, about five hundred yeares after Christ, yet I will rather chuse to confute this by the confession of *Sancta Clara* out of *Horantius*, who to this objection, that *sub Evangelio* (which must mean when the Gospel was preacht) no such precept is extant, not onely denies it not, but gives this reason for it,

Lib.15.C.28

Pag.271.

leaſt the *Pagans* ſhould think themſelves brought againe to the worſhipping of Men inſtead of Gods : If upon this or any other reaſon this were not then taught, then have not all your Doctrines ſuch a Pedigree as you ſuppoſe, but allow it were, yet, howſoever it followes, that, ſome, at leaſt, of the learned of your Church have not been taught that they have, or conſequently that it is neceſſary they ſhould have : Though it ſeemes to me little leſs then *Montaniſme* to believe that any ſince (as it were a Paraclet) ſhould perfect the doctrine which then was delivered by the Apoſtles: Neither can you anſwer that they ſpeake onely of ſuch a Precept, and of being extant, whereas they might teach it lawfull without giving any Precept, and they might have given ſuch a Precept although not extant; for I ſhould readily reply, that the reaſon they give why there is none ſuch extant, ſhewes, that they mean there was none at all, neither Precept, nor allowance, ſince the *Pagans* would have been ſcandaliz'd at its being accounted lawfull to worſhip men inſtead of Gods, although it were not commanded, and not a whit the leſſe, whether that in after times were extant or not, which they could not foreſee.

The onelie anſwer which I am able to invent in your behalfe, is this, that though ſome of your particular doctrines have not ſuch a Tradition, yet there being a Tradition that the Churches definitions are infallible, whatſoever ſhe at any time defines, is then to be believed upon the ſtrength of ſuch a Tradition, and before did *latere in cauſis*

as

as Flowers do in Winter.

Yet to this I may reply by desiring you to enter with me into some few considerations.

First, If this were so, and that so much of Christian Religion depends upon the definitions of the Church, and our Reception of them, upon knowing alwaies which is she, and that such is her authority, can you perswade your selfe, that Christ sending his Apostles and Disciples to Preach the Gospel, and after four of them writing his Gospel, (which shewes if the Books be true to the title, that they writ all they preacht, at least that was necessarie; for else they were not Gospels, but Parts of it) that they should not rather leave out any thing else, how important soever, then not have imploied themselves about teaching us, that the Churches Definitions are a Rule of our Faith, and instructing us in Markes so proper to her, that we might never need to doubt, whether it be she that defines or no, and whether their not having done this, evince not in Reason that this your Doctrine is false?

Secondly, I pray consider whether if there were any such continu'd Tradition about the Definitions of the Church, whether that must not also have taught, (or else have been to small purpose) when it is that the Church hath defin'd: but yet that is a case not fully judged among you, For some hold, that the Church hath defin'd when a Councel hath, although unapproved by the Pope, which is denied by others.

Thirdly, Consider whether (supposing as was before

before ſuppos'd) it muſt not alſo have taught certaine Notes to know the Church by: but yet about thoſe you are not agreed, *Salmeron* putting Miracles among the falſe Signes of the Church, and *Bellarmine* and many more among the True ones. *Tom.* 13. Pag. 193.

Fourthly, Conſider whether the Church have an eternall ſpring of Doctrines within her, or but a finite number, and onely thoſe which the Apoſtles preacht: and I believe you will pitch upon the latter. Not then to ask how they come to know them, nor, if you anſwer by Tradition, to ask you againe how come men then not to know (before a Definition) what it is they Preacht? for if the Biſhops (of which a Councell is compounded) know it not now, how will they know it when they meet? I will deſire to know why the Church will not at once teach us all ſhe knowes, and not keep us in doubts, which ſhe may reſolve? and did the, Apoſtles teach their Doctrines to be lockt up, or taught to us? And then having conſidered this, you will find I believe, that the Church do with Doctrines, as Fathers with Eſtates, never give their Children all, that they may ſtill have ſomething to keep them in awe with; becauſe if ſhe ſhould, ſhe could never have after pretended a Power to end any new emergent controverſie, keeping in ſecret what ſhe knowes, any that ariſeth, ſhe may ſtill pretend is endable by her.

Fiftly, Conſider that it will appear but a ſhift, if you ſay that there is a Tradition that all the Churches Definitions be true, and ſo excuſe the particular Doctrines, for otherwiſe having none, and

and yet avoid giving us any Rules to know the Church by at all times, and anſwering thoſe Queſtions, which muſt be ended before we can know at any time when ſhe hath defin'd.

Now I confeſſe if you had ſaid Tradition teacheth, that the particular Church of *Rome* is ſo the Admiral ſhip, that we may know any other if it be of God's Fleet, becauſe then it muſt follow her, that is, be ſubject to her decrees, & theirs which joyn with her, this would have bin plainly to let me know your mind, and we might quickly have examin'd, whether there were any Tradition for the Church in this ſence to be alwaies obeyed when ſhe Teaches, and without you ſay this, you ſay nothing, and will never be able to give any ſuch Note of the Church, as the ignorant may without bluſhing pretend to know it by: Becauſe therefore I gueſſe, that when not I, but your Adverſaries reaſons (for I am but one of the worſt tranſcribers of them) have driven you from your own Fort, you muſt retire to that of your friends, or like them which are drowning, you will rather catch at a Twigg, then ſink: I will conſider this Aſſertion, which I ſuppoſe you muſt lay hold of ſo far forth as to ſhew it to be indeed but an Aſſertion. That there hath no ſuch Verbal Tradition (nor indeed any) come downe, ſeems to me for theſe reaſons.

Saint *Cyprian* by oppoſing the Church of *Rome*, and that with many Biſhops about the Rebaptization, ſhewes ſufficiently, that he and they knew of no ſuch Tradition; and then in what Cave muſt it have lain hid, if the chiefe Doctor of that age was ignorant

ignorant of it, and even his Adversaries claim'd it not? And that he knew no such, appears not onely by his Actions, but also by his words; for to them who claim'd Tradition for the particular point propos'd, (though none for the Authority of the Church proposing) he answers, if it be contain'd in the Gospels, Epistles, or Acts, let it be observed, at one blow cutting off not onely that (for sure this authority of the Church of *Rome* is no way taught in the Scriptures) but all other unwritten Traditions, which Cardinal *Perron*, thought most skilfull in that kind of Fence, was not able to ward, but *Du Plesis* objecting it receiv'd no other answer, then that the opinion of *Cyprian* was condemn'd, and that Tradition, although unwritten, maintain'd. Which answer though it be as far from befitting the Cardinall, as from answering the objection (since it is plaine, that this opinion was once held by such as were of chiefe estimation among the Orthodox, and consequently the contrary was not then the generall and necessary doctrine of Christians, and the prevailing of the one since proves not the other false, but rather unfortunate, or the spreaders faulty) yet I confesse I excuse him, for as I have learnt from *Aristotle*, that it is ridiculous to expect a Demonstration where the matter will beare but a probability, so would it be in me to expect even a probable solution of an Argument, the evidence of which will suffer none at all.

Neither was he (I mean *Cyprian*) the first, that without blot of Heresie oppos'd the Tradition

tion of the Church of *Rome*, but that courage which he left to others after him, when they ſaw the Chriſtian World joyne in counting him a Saint, and a Martyr, whom the Biſhop of *Rome* had ſtiled a falſe Chriſt, and a falſe Apoſtle, the ſame had he received by ſeeing that the *Aſian* Biſhops had alſo rejected, and oppos'd her Tradition; and yet *Policrates* lever had in great honour, and the reſt never branded with the crime of Hereſie; nay, even the more neighbouring Biſhops, and who joyn'd with the Pope in the time of celebrating *Eaſter* (as *Iræneus*) yet thought the difference not worth excommunication, and for want of skill in the Canon Law, tranſgreſt ſo farre as to reprehend for it, whereas if to that Church all elſe had been to conform themſelves, then *Iræneus* ought therefore to have thought the matter of weight enough, becauſe ſhe thought it ſo, who were to ſmall purpoſe made a Judge, if ſhe were not as well enabled to diſtinguiſh between ſlight and materiall, as between Falſe and Truth, though that it ſeemes ſhe was not: for the Church of *Rome* never refus'd their Communion before, though ſhe knew them to hold the ſame opinion, and ſo (as plainly appeares) counted that materiall in one Age, which ſhe had not ſo eſteemed in others, and therefore (in the degree at leaſt of holding what ſhe held) contradicted herſelf, and followed Traditions.

And as *Cyprian* imitated them, ſo did the *African* Biſhops him, for a Queſtion hapning between them and the Biſhops of *Rome* about *Appeales*, though they abſolutely oppos'd him, and

(in vaine I confeſſe) deſired him that he would not bring into the Church *Typhum hujus Sæculi*, the ſwelling pride of this World, and though he laboured infinitely in the buſineſſe πάντα λίθον κινῶν, that he might bring it to paſſe, yet he, and two of his ſucceſſors were either ſo unready, or ſo unskil'd in the preſent *Roman* Doctrine, *that Feed my ſheeep*, *and thou art Peter*, were either out of their knowledge, or out of their memory, and they alleadged, not any power *jure divino*, but onely pretended to a Cannon of the Councel of *Nice*, which when the *Affricans* found not in their coppies, (for they would not believe the Church of *Rome* ſo farre as to truſt to hers, though now you generally think the Scripture it ſelfe to have its authority *quoad nos*, onely for her definitions) they ſent to the *Eaſt* to enquire there, and finding their coppies agreeing with theirs, they then more reſolutely withſtood the Pretence, which brought at that time nothing to the Popes, but repulſe and ſhame.

And indeed, not to object that it is not numbered among any of the ancient Heriſies, that they differ'd from the particular *Roman* Church, nor is this Rule, of being ſure at all times to joyne with her, ever given by thoſe Fathers who ſet us waies and Antidotes how to ſecure our ſelves againſt Hereſie, (which could not have been left undone if they had known any ſuch Tradition) nor to ſpeak of the Cannon of the Councell of *Chalcedon*, which attributes the power of the Popes to the gift of their Fathers, and that againe to *Romes* being

being the head City; ſetting all this aſide, I will aske your ſelfe if it be not plain that thoſe Fathers, who (upon the impudent pretence of ſome Hereticks) ſend men to ſeverall places to enquire after Tradition, either ſend them to all the Apoſtolicall churches, or (to ſave their labour) to that to which they were neareſt, as eſteeming them all of equall authority (though not jurisdiction) for I may ſay of *Rome*, and them, as *Tacitus* doth of *Cælius* and the other Commanders (*Mutato nomine*) the name onely chang'd) *Pares jure*, *Roma audendo potentior*, for what by watching all occaſions to greaten herſelfe, whereof Cardinal *D' Oſſat* is my witneſſe, what by abuſing the reſpect all men had ever given her, in reſpect of the chiefe Apoſtles which founded her, of the Empire which was long ſeated in her, and of her ancient Biſhops, whereof about thirtie toge her were martyr'd there, what by interpreting what was given to her Authority, as given to her Power, and taking civilities and complements (of which no Court is now ſo full as the ancient Biſhops were) made to Popes for alleagiance ſworn to them, what by forging falſe decretall Epiſtles (which the Tearmed Authors of them would not forgive them for, if they knew it, if it were onely for the barbarous language) what by theſe, and ſuch other waies, ſhe is come at length to that paſſe, that what *Avitus* a *Roman* Generall ſaid to the *Anſibarians*, who gave him reaſons why he ought not in juſtice to diſturbe their poſſeſſions, *Id Diis placitum, ut Arbitrium penes Romanos maneret quid darent, quidve adimerent, neque alios Judices*

Pag. 208. *and* 687.

Tacitus.

dices quam ſeipſos paterentur. It is the will of Heaven, that it be left to the *Romans* what they will pleaſe to give or take away, and ſuffer not any Judges but themſelves, appeares now not ſo much a Hiſtory of the Pride of the *Roman* Empire, as a Prophecy of the generall doctrine of the *Roman* Church.

Having ever marked Error and Confidence to keep ſo much company, that I ſeldome find the firſt, but I miſtruſt the ſecond, makes me loath to affirme any thing over-dogmatically out of theſe objections, or ſay that they cannot be anſwered; Onely (becauſe I muſt not offend againſt Truth, for feare of offending againſt Modeſty) I will take leave to ſay, that if I could have anſwered them my ſelfe, I would not have put you to the trouble of doing it, which you might alſo have ſav'd, if by letting me know your name, you would have enabled me to have found you out, and ſo in a ſhort diſcourſe have tried whether I could have obtain'd that ſatisfaction from your words, which I muſt now expect from your Pen. But ſuppoſing I had none of theſe objections, yet two things beſides would have kept me from aſſenting to what you ſay: The firſt is, that your men, when they aske us how we know Scripture to be Scripture, and this to be the ſence of it, tell us withall, that unleſſe we know it by ſome more infallible way then our owne Reaſon (they mean their Church) it will not ſerve for a beliefe of thoſe things which are to be believ'd by a divine Faith; Now this Argument of yours upon which you build

build all, (allowing that it appear'd good reaſon) yet at moſt it is but reaſon, and liable to the ſame exceptions, unleſſe the ſame thing be a wall when you leane upon it, and a bulruſh when we doe. The ſecond is, that all you ſay (for as yet you ſpeak not of the Authority of the Particnlar Church of *Rome*, though you muſt at length come to it, though by that too little is to be gotten) if it were granted, would but prove thoſe who adhere now to the Church of *Rome* to be now in the right, but I asked for a guide, which might without new ſearch ſerve me the next yeer, as well as this; For (for all that you have prov'd) ſhe may leave the way you ſay ſhe now pretends to walk in, and attempt to reform too, (which I wiſh were as probable as it is poſſible) or there may ariſe a ſchiſme between two parts of thoſe Churches which now adhere to the *Roman*, and both may claime Tradition, (for what hath been may be againe) and how ſhall I know then which ſide to take, ſince both will ſeem equally good by that Touchſtone which you appoint me to try with. And if I be then ſent to try by Ancient Writers, it is certaine, that (beſides the fallibility of that way for the learned) this cannot be done at all by the ignorant, and it is probable that both Parties will fall into that abſurdity, into which the Church of *Rome* daily runs, which is, that although the evidence which ſhe claimes by cannot well be exactlie read over in thirty yeares time, yet ſhe requires us under paine of Damnation to give our Verdicts for her by twenty yeeres old.

The Second Part.

Object. *THe high and Sage Maſter of our Faith hath in vaine ſpent ſo much ſweat, and paines, if after he paſſed from hence, he hath left no meanes to aſſure mankind, what it was he taught and practiſed.*

Reſp. I ſuppoſe this ſpeech is directed at me who (as you conceive) take away all meanes, becauſe I have no Judge; but I would faine know of you, whether *Plato*, and *Ariſtotle* have not left us meanes to know what they taught, although they have not left us any living infallible Judge to deliver us their doctrine verbally, or to expound their works: Or if you intended your Accent upon the word *Aſſure*, and if you mean by that ſome infallible knowledge, I deſire you (out of your own words) to conſider whether humane nature be capable of it. For my part ſuppoſing as I doe, that his Faith is in a ſufficient degree, which brings forth obedience, I require not any motives more, aſſuring (except from them who claime, that they cannot erre) then ſuch as any man unpræpoſſeſt with paſſion or prejudice will beleeve ſufficiently to obey; and ſuch in my opinion are mine: For though I know, you count any way without a guide but groping in the dark, yet if God had not given us ſo much light as we deſired, we muſt not therefore ſet up falſe lights, and becauſe we would be ſure to have a guide, make one our ſelves: But he ſeemes to me

me, to have dealt with us in Religon not very un-analogically, to what he hath in the world, giving us two lights, Scripture, and Universall Tradition, whereof one gives light to the other, and both to us: Universall Tradition is our Guide to Scripture (as whatsoever else that guided us to we would receive, if there were any such thing) and Scripture is our way to God; By Universall Tradition we know much better, that these Books were written by Christs Disciples (who are sufficient witnesses of what he taught) then the *Aristotelians* know that these were *Aristotles* works, or the *Academicks* knew *Plato's*, since Christians have both kept them with more care, and in the acceptance of them used more caution, as thinking them so much more important: In the Scripture I conceive, that (according to that rule, which I am sure I have either read in *Chrysostome*, or very often quoted out of him) πάντα ἀναγκαῖα δῆλα, all that is necessary is clear, or if any man that strives to square both his actions and opinions by that Rule, chance to fall into any error (for which his understanding is onely in fault and not his will) it shall not hinder his rising to heaven: Such an infallible way excludes, if not all use, at least all necessity of an infallible guide, and is as good as a Judge to keep Unity in Charitie (which is onely needfull) though not in opinions; and indeed since you must grant, that if any man mis-interpret the Councell of Trent, it shall not damne him, so he doubt not of its truth, desire to discover what

what it meant, and be in a Propenſion of beleeving, that when he knowes it, me thinkes (as *Cineas* told *Pirrhus*) you had as good doe that at firſt, which you muſt doe at laſt, that is, ſay the ſame with us at firſt concerning Scripture, which after much trouble, you are forced to ſay concerning Councels, and in hard matters let the ſame implicite Faith in God ſerve, which ſerves in them, who can claime no authority but from, and under him: And (which is more then I affirme) that no man, but by his own, being wicked, can come into any error by falſe interpretation of Scripture, ſee I pray, what Saint *Auſtine* ſaies in his forty ninth Sermon *de Verbis Domini*, that God hath ſo hedg'd in all his own ſayings, that whoſoever would interpret any place of Scripture falſe, he that hath a circumciſed heart by reading what is before and after, may find that ſence which the other would pervert.

Yet if you can ſhew me reaſon to beleeve that there is any ſtanding guide upon earth (and without reaſon it were unreaſonable to hope to perſwade me to beleeve it) I will never be proud ſo much to my own coſt, as rather to venture looſing my way by chuſing it my ſelfe, then be beholding to him for directing me in it.

Object. *Thoſe to whom during his life, he had moſt fully declared his mind, went and told it to others, and all was done; But this way hath the prejudice of humane Fallibility, for ſeldome it hapneth, that a multitude can carry away all in the ſame manner, and one thouſand ſix hundred yeares are paſſed ſince,*

yet

yet if we looke into the immediate joynts of the deſcent, we cannot finde where it can miſſe: for the doctrine being ſupernaturall, and not delivered by any mans skill, or wit, the maine principle of it can be no other, then to know what was delivered them by their Teachers: when therefore an Apoſtle had preached over and over again the ſame Doctrine, not long, nor hard to be carryed away in all the Townes of a Countrey, and let him be gone, and all dead who heard him ſpeake, and ſome queſtions ariſe concerning his doctrine, let us ſee whether error can creep in if Chriſtians keep to their hold, that is, what they were taught by Chriſts Apoſtles. Let therefore the wiſeſt and beſt of thoſe Townes meet and diſcuſſe the controverſie out of this principle, will not there be a quick end of their diſpute? For every man can ſay, Thus my Father heard the Apoſtle ſpeak, and what is here certaine of the Children of thoſe who heard them, may with as much evidence be deriv'd againe in the Grand-children, and ſo in every age.

Thoſe writings, whoſe buſineſſe is to prove, ſhould be like the houſes in the Low Countries, for as there they take ſuch care of their foundations, that what is under ground coſts them more then all above it, ſo in theſe, the greateſt labour ought to be in ſetling ſurely the Principles, becauſe ἑνὸς ἀτόπου δοθέντος one abſurditie granted, how fertile error is after, what a heard or ſwarme of ſtrange concluſions follow, not onely your ſelfe have obſerv'd, but *Ariſtotle* alſo hath told all that have read him, and experience daily tels mankind; *Reſp.*

ſince therefore a ſmall miſtake encreaſeth as much, and as ſpeedily as a graine of muſtard-ſeed, I muſt the earneſtlier contradict this πρῶτον ψεῦδος, this firſt error of yours, as being the Parent of ſo many more already, and being likely in time (if by being confuted it be not us'd as *Saturne* us'd his Father) to have yet a more large and numerous Iſſue.

1 Then you leave out one thing out of your Hiſtory of the Goſpell, which alone conſider'd, would have much weaken'd what you ſay; For you ſpeak of the Apoſtles, but forget utterly their Writings, a miſ-interpretation of which might ſoon ſpread an error. And certainlie out of them, if Chriſtians had been to receive no Inſtructions, but onely to remember what was taught them by word of mouth, both they would have ſav'd themſelves the labour of writing them, and Traditors, who deliver'd them to be burnt, would have been thought to have committed no greater fault, then if they had done the ſame to any ordinary writing: But if the firſt Chriſtians, and generally their ſucceſſours ſince, have ever carefully and aſſiduouſly ſtudied (what by comparing places, what by all other waies) to underſtand them, and thought themſelves bound to beleeve, and obey whatſoever they found, or thought they found there contain'd, and eſteem'd that they were taught by themſelves, what they learnt from their writings (as they muſt have thought it the ſame thing, unleſſe the Apoſtles authority had vaniſht, by having their inſtructi-

ons

ons put into paper, which were as if the Kings verball Commands bound us, but not his Proclamations.) Then here appeares a gate at which errors might enter, which you (at least I am sure this part of your Treatise) did not consider.

But even their verball might either bee mis-interpreted, or knowinglie mis-alledged, even by those who are counted *Archi*-Catholicks, for I pray, must not one of those two have been done, or by the Church of *Rome*, or by those of *Asia* (which example I would not so often speake of, but that I hope δὶς καὶ τρὶς τὰ ἀληθῆ is as good an excuse, as δὶς καὶ τρὶς τὰ καλά:) For since it is impossible, that Saint *John* and Sain *Peter* both inspir'd by the Holy Ghost, which is the Spirit of Truth, should teach contradictorie doctrines, whereof one must necessarily be false, what else can follow, but that one part (if not both) intended to deceive, or were themselves deceiv'd in it (and what makes it impossible, that such a mistake by men of authoritie may not generallie spread) and after a plaine example your reason will be no more able to overthrow experience, then the earthen Pitcher, in the Fable, was to break the Brasen one, χύτρα καὶ πέτρα οὐ συμφωνεῖ. 2 *Socrat. lib. 5.*

One of the Arguments you make for the infallibility of the way which you propound, is, *That the Doctrine, which the Apostles taught was neither long nor hard to be carried away*, Out of which me thinkes I can evidently deduce that the Church of *Rome* is not that, since both it appears how long that s, and since you tell us your selfe, *That the cause* 3

of many errors among you is the multiplicity of Catholique Doctrines, which doth not oblige a man o the knowledge of every Part, but to a prompt ſubjection to the Church. Truely if there be no contradiction between theſe two Propoſitions, I will confeſſe that I have hitherto miſtaken what the word ſignifies, unleſſe you mean, that the Apoſtle by teaching ſubjection to the Church induſively, taught all that ſhe teaches, and ſo what they delivered was ſhort, but what implicitely, much; If this were ſo, certainely the Apoſtles, when they included almoſt all their doctrine in the ſubjection enjoyn'd to the Church, taught ſome certaine markes by which men might at all times know her, though you pretend to none but ſuch as the *Greeke* Church as much claime (which is enough to ſcruple the ignorant) and rightly too, as the *Roman* (as Antiquity, Succeſſion, Miracles, *&c.*) excepting onely communion with the Pope, and ſplendor, whereof neither are proper markes of the true Church, that is ſuch as can never be abſent from her, ſince the Hereſie of a Pope (which hath been, and is not by your owne whole Church held impoſſible) may take away the one way, and a generall Perſecution the other.

4 It appeares alſo by what you ſpeake of the immediate jointes of the deſcent, that you ſuppoſe if any errour come in, ſome one Age muſt joyn to teach it, which by no meanes followes, no more then one Age of them at *Rome* joyn'd to teach their Poſterity *Italian* inſtead of *Latine*, but ſome may have taught a Doctrine to be probable in one Age, more then

in

in the ſecond, and all in the third, according to *Seneca*'s obſervation. The error of few (eſpecially when Notable Perſons) begetting the error of a multitude; and againe the authority of a multitude deceiving Particular men, and ſo by degrees it may be thought from Probable, True, from true *fere de Fide*, from that abſolutely a part of Faith, and conſequently to have come from Tradition, whilſt the contrary opinion being firſt believ'd the more improbable, next falſe, from falſe Temerary, from temerary, *Hæreſi proximum*, and from that abſolutely Hereticall, hath by almoſt inſenſible degrees met with a mighty change, and is arriv'd at Hell before it almoſt misdoubted it. And that theſe progreſſe-Doctrines have travel'd, it is eaſie for any man to ſee who hath been but a little converſant in your own Books, and whoſoever denies it, may as well deny that their is any green in Summer, when there is hardly any thing elſe.

And for the Caſe you put, that the wiſeſt, and beſt of the Townes where Doctrines were delivered ſhould have met *&c.* I both ſuppoſe, that the controverſie of who were beſt and wiſeſt, would not it ſelf have been eaſily ended, but allowing that it might have been eaſily done, and would have been moſt uſefully done, yet it never was; and ſo ſuppoſe the way never ſo good, it was yet like a Medicine, which be it never ſo Soveraigne, can never cure if it be never taken; Councells there have been call'd Ancient, becauſe leſſe Modern, and generall, becauſe leſſe particular (for the first

firſt was not till more then three hundred yeeres after Chriſt, nor to the largeſt appeares it, that ever any were ſummon'd from beyond the bounds of the Ancient *Roman* Empire, though Chriſtianity were much farther extended: Some leſſe meetings or *Conciliabula* there were indeed before, but none of theſe accounted infallible by your ſelves (though me thinks they ſhould by your grounds) and indeed it would go ill with your own infallibility if you ſhould, for of the two moſt notable, the one defended Rebaptization, and the other condemned *Samoſatenus*, and in doing ſo taught as plain *Arrianiſme*, (if we might know mens meaning by their words, which if we cannot, all arguing, eſpecially from what any Authors ſay, is ended) as even *Arrius* himſelf was condemned for at *Nice*; If theſe intended to diſcuſſe the Controverſie out of the Principle you ſpeak of, and yet miſs'd Tradition when they meant to have followed it, then ſo might your beſt and wiſeſt men have done too; if they did not intend it, then it ſeemes it hath not been held needfull alwaies by Catholikes to try Doctrines by that *Criterium*, which you now preſcribe.

Object. *Who can be ignorant what he was taught when he was a child, as the ground and ſubſtance of his hopes for all Eternity?*

Reſp. Truely the ordinary ſort more then moſt eaſily: For becauſe either their mind wanders, or their Teachers deſcend not to their capacities, they commonly goe away both from publique Sermons and private Catechiſmes, as if they had receiv'd

receiv'd inſtructions in a language as ſtrange to them, as that wherein they ſay their prayers: Beſides their own Fathers teach them little or nothing, becauſe that is as much as they have learnt themſelves, (eſpecially in ignorant places and times) their Ghoſtly Fathers teach them moſt, but that much more concerning life then opinions; ſo that though they were not ignorant of all they were taught, yet they are abſolute ſtrangers to the greateſt part of what your Church teaches; And if now no more of their Religion be delivered by Verball Tradition, what was then, when many points, which are now often taught (though not conſtantly and in all places but upon occaſions) were not thought of in many yeeres? Suppoſe that about the Queſtion of what makes a Prieſt, a convocation of men had met (I mean of ſuch who knew not what was taught in Bookes) before *Luthers* time (and what I ſay would be true in ſomewhat a leſſe degree of this more inſtructed Age) what account could they have given what they had been taught when they were Children? Truely they could have ſaid, we know it to be the cuſtome for our Biſhops to make Prieſts, and ſome of us have heard he onely is to make them, what is done and taught in other places we know not: Very far would they have been from all agreeing that they were taught when they were Children (as part of the ground of their hopes for all Eternity) by their Fathers, as receiv'd from theirs, as come down from the Apoſtles; that he is no Prieſt, to whom in expreſſe tearmes

Com-

Commiſſion is not given to offer for the living and the dead, which now being objected to the Clergy of *England*, perſwades me, that your Church teacheth more then generally men are taught when Children, or indeed at any time by any Verball Tradition: For not onely the Ordinary ſort, but even your moſt learned men knew not what is Tradition, if that be ſtill your Rule of Faith; for they diſagree among themſelves, whether ſome things be of Faith or no; as for Example, Whether the Pope can erre in the Cannonization of a Saint, for if all Queſtions were that way to be ended, and ſuch Traditions were evident, (as if they were ſuch as you ſpeak of they muſt be) all your ſide muſt be ſoone reſolv'd both in this, and all other ſuch Queſtions; And if you ſay that indeed all Particular Doctrines are not taught by ſuch a Tradition, but that by ſo much as all are taught, they know their Judge and Director concerning them, and ſo are taught them implicitely, I anſwer, that the Vulgar, although they are generally told that the Church is infallible, yet I doubt whether they be either taught that this Doctrine hath had any ſuch generall and uninterrupted a delivery, or have heard much concerning thoſe meanes, by which ſhe her-ſelfe is to be known, or thoſe Circumſtances, by which we are to know when ſhe expreſſeth her opinion: That the Pope is the Head of the Church they know, but whether Tradition teach him to be ſo of Divine, or humane Right, from God, of Councels, or tacite conſent, and what Power is included in that Head-ſhip,

Wadd. Pag. 30.

ſhip, a *Mahumetan* is as much inſtructed as moſt of them, and even his head-ſhip is ordinarily prov'd to them but out of ſome place of Scripture, out of which they hear his Infallibility concluded too, without being told the different degree in which thoſe two Doctrines are to be held. Secondly, For the learned, neither are they taught ſo well ſome of theſe things, but that they differ concerning them, and your ſelf fly wholly ſpeaking of them, leaving them to agree among themſelves, and (as Cardinall *Perron* ſaies in one place, he will do us Proteſtants when we differ) ſuffering the dead to bury the dead; If then neither are you all agreed by what to know your Church, nor when ſhe hath defin'd, ſo that even what is of faith is undermined among you, I find cauſe to beleeve, that Tradition is no excellent Director of you, even in your grounds, no not to teach you to know that which ſhould teach you all the reſt; And if you were, yet at the ſame wicket, and by the ſame degrees, by which I have ſhewd that other errors both may, and have not onely entered into your Church, but aſcended alſo to high places there; this doctrine concerning your Director might have done the ſame.

His *Opuſc.*

True it is, that very little is generally and conſtantlie taught in all ages to the people, and that which is ſeldome, is told them to have been ſo receiv'd from hand to hand by the verball Tradition you ſpeak of; and if they be at any time taught ſo, and remember it, yet they know not whether the next Curate teach the ſame, at leaſt,

if under the ſame notion and degree of Neceſſitie: Indeed it would not be ſo intricate a worke (as now adaies it is) to be a Chriſtian, if your way had been onely followed: but it is not this Tradition, but the writings of paſt Ages, which tranſmit to poſteritie the opinions of the Doctors of paſt times, many of them being erroneous, and more unneceſſarie; out of theſe works the learned learne, and teach againe in their workes, what the greater part (the unlearned) ſcarce ever heare of; out of theſe they ſettle the degrees your Doctrines are to be held in, ſome as probable, ſome true, ſome almoſt neceſſarie, ſome altogether, and teach concerning others, that ſome are falſe, ſome dangerous, ſome damnable, whereas the vulgar have ſeldome their meat ſo curiouſlie joynted to them, but are told in generall for the moſt part (unleſſe ſome publick oppoſition, or other occaſion perſwade them at ſome time to deſcend to teach them more particularlie) that this is ſo good, and this is not ſo: And indeed the degree in which the laſt Age held ſuch an opnion, is both moſt hard to know (not onely becauſe the ignorant are ſeldom taught it by word of mouth, and the learned have ſeldome occaſion, without ſome oppoſition, to explaine themſelves ſo farre in their writings) but becauſe alſo as many, and as conſiderable Perſons not writing, as doe write, we cannot know by the Authors, what the whole Age thought true (except the acceptation of that Doctrine were a condition of the Commu-

nion)

nion) and moſt neceſſarie to be known, becauſe moſt of our controverſies with your Church are as much, if not more, about the neceſſitie of her opinions, as about the truth of them: For we ſeeing plainlie, that in the pureſt ages many of the chiefeſt Doctors have contradicted ſome of her Tenets, without ſuſpicion of Hereſie, are not able to conceive how a doctrine ſhould, from being indifferent in one age, become neceſſarie in another, and the contrarie from onely falſe Hereticall,

——— As time makes Botches Pox,
And plodding on will make a Calfe an Oxe. *Dr. D.*

eſpecially if that way had allwaies been walkt in, which you now ſpeak of.

No judicious man can deny to ſee with his eyes, (if he have caſt them never ſo little upon the preſent ſtate of Chriſtendome) that there is one Congregation of men which layeth claime to Chriſt his Doctrine, as upon this title, that ſhe hath received it from his Apoſtles without interruption, delivered from Father to Son untill this day, and admits not any Doctrine for good and legitimate, which ſhe doth not receive in this manner. Object.

What the Judicious (of whom I am no member) can do, I know not, but I not onely can, but do deny it, you meaning by that Congregation the Church of *Rome*, for by ſeeing, that not upon this, but other kind of claim certaine Doctrines have arrived to the very brink of being defined, I have cauſe to think, that if they received none in upon *Reſp.*

on other grounds, theſe would not be ſuffered to ſtand ſo neer the doore. And indeed there being between your ſelfe ſuch differences, that *Eraſmus* tels us, that he who is a Heretick among the *Dominicans*, is Orthodox to the *Scotiſts*, ſure one ſide hath admitted of a Doctrine for Legitimate, which hath not been ſo received, and then me thinks this being eaſily endable, which it is, by ſeeing which claimes ſuch a delivery, (for if both do it, then two Parts may, which you deny, if neither do, then your whole Church goes by ſome other Rule) that which doth, upon that which you call the Catholique Grounds, me thinks ſhould have obtained a definition for her, and the other, which reſiſts that Principle, upon which they ought onely to build, ſhould have been ſuddenly and abſolutely condemned. This will appeare plainer, if we conſider the opinions of your Church by the Actions of her Head, in a notable and late Example. A great controverſie being riſen between the *Dominicans* and the *Jeſuites*, it was heard before Pope *Clement*, let us ſee then what courſe he took to find which Part held the Truth, ſince he was not likely (eſpecially in a time wherein, by being more oppoſed then uſually, he had reaſons to be conſequently more cautious) to chuſe a new way, by which truth was not wont to be found out by your ſide upon like occaſions; Did he ſend for the wiſeſt and beſt men from all, nay from adjoyning Parts, to enquire of them what they had been taught by their Fathers, to have been received by them uninterruptedly from the Apoſtles? did

Præfat. in Hillar.

did he examine with which of them the firſt and pureſt ages ſided? did he conſider which opinion would make us have the more excellent conceit of God, and work moſt towards the expelling of Vice? None of all theſe were his courſe, but he appointed both ſides, to prove which of them followed Saint *Auſtine*, and according to them, he intended to give ſentence, if the advice of Cardinall *Perron* had not prevailed to the contrary: But many days they ſpent in examining what he thought, who thought ſo variouſly concerning it, that he ſcarce knew himſelf which, whereas before him all the Ancients that I could ever meet with, were with the Ieſuites with an Vnanimous conſent, and by them (if they muſt be tried by men as fallible as themſelves) it would have better agreed with their own Principles to have had both Parts judged.

After the Pope, let us hear Biſhop, and allmoſt Cardinall Fiſher, who being one of your own Authors and Martyrs, cannot be thought to prævaricate againſt that Church, for whoſe defence he imployed not onely his Inke, but his Blood.

His words are theſe,

There are many things of which was no enquirie in the Primitive Church, which yet upon doubts ariſing, are now become perſpicuous, by the diligence of after-times. And that you may ſee, that he ſpeakes of points of Faith, He addes,

No Orthodox man now doubts, whether there be a Purgatory, of which yet among the Ancients there is no mention, or exceeding rarely: It is not believed Pag. 496.

by

by the Greeks *to this day---Neither did the* Latines *conceive this Truth at once, but by little and little.*

And for an *Epiphonema* he cloſeth it thus,

Pag. 497. *Conſidering that Purgatory was a good while unknown; after, partly by Revelations, partly by Scripture came little by little to be believed by ſome, and ſo at laſt the beliefe of it was generally received by the Catholique Churches---Who can wonder concerning Indulgencies, that in the Primitive Church there was no uſe of them? Indulgences therefore began, after men had trembled a while at the Torments of Purgatory.*

See I pray how will you two agree? You ſay the Church of *Rome* receives, but what ſhe claimes to be come down to her from the Apoſtles without interruption: He ſaith ſome of her Doctrines were long unknown, and came in by Revelations and Scripture; you ſay new Doctrines cannot come into a Church that, holds this Principle: He ſaith, Doctrines have come in by little and little: So either ſhe held not allwaies this Principle, or for all that they might come in: To be ſhort, all, which he hath ſaid, ſeemes to me, as if he had purpoſely intended to frame a Ram to batter down that fortification, which you have built about the *Roman* Church.

Now though he be of ſo great an Authority that he needs no backing, yet I will deſire you to look into *Alphonſus de Caſtro*, where he ſpeakes of Indulgences, and ſee if he mend the matter. He confeſſeth, that the uſe of them ſeemes to be late received

ceived into the Church, yet would not have them contemned, becauſe many things are known to after-commers, of which thoſe ancient Writers were wholly ignorant. Amongſt whom there is rarely mention of *Tranſubſtantiation*, more rarely of the *Proceſſion* of the Holy Ghoſt from the Son, of Purgatory almoſt none; For though he ſpeaks after as if he meant onely that the names of theſe were unmentioned, and not the things, yet it is plaine, that if he brought them in to any purpoſe, it was to prove, that ſome Doctrines are after of neceſſity to be believed, which once were not, and Doctrines conſiſt in the Things, not in the Name.

I could next tell you of *Eraſmus* his ſaying, *Res deducta eſt ad Sophiſticas contentiones, & Articulorum Miriades proruperunt.* Religion is come down to Sophiſtry, and a Miriad of Articles are broken out. But knowing that his words will not find ſo much reſpect, (becauſe he himſelf finds leſſe favour) as thoſe of others more allowed among you, let us mark theſe words of *Sancta Clara*, The Church, when it is ſaid to define any thing, ſhe reſts not upon any new Revelations, but upon the ancient, lying hid in writings and words of the Apoſtles, which he ſayes not as his private opinion, but the conſtant beliefe of Doctors: By which it appeares plainly, that there are at leaſt interpretations of what the Apoſtles taught, drawn forth by Reaſon, not received by Tradition, which makes now a part of the preſent *Roman* Religion, a ſufficient Gappe for Errors to enter at, when either

Epiſt. Pag. 1164.

Pag. 296. 1 *Edit.*

either miſtakings, or ends may become new opinions, and ſtile them but interpretations of the old. *Salmeron* a Voluminous Jeſuite, one, neither by his order, nor his inclination an enemy at all to the *Roman* Church, being preſs'd by the opinions of the Ancients, affirmes, *Doctores quò juniores, eò perſpicaciores eſſe*, That the more modern Doctors are, the more preſpicatious, that *per incrementa Temporum nota facta ſunt Divina myſteria, quæ tamen antea multos latuerunt*: In proceſſe of time Divine Myſteries have been made known, which before lay hid from many; That it is infirm arguing from Authority, and anſwers to the multitude of them, who in times paſt had oppoſed him, with theſe words of *Exodus*, That the opinion of many is not to be followed, leading us out of the way, with ſome other very Anabaptiſticall anſwers, and very contrary to your Tenets, (for ſure it were a ſtrange Tradition, which had ſo many Orthodox Oppoſers) and nothing inferiour to that ſaying of *Zuinglius*, ſo much exaggerated, *Quid mihi cum Patribus, potius quam cum Matribus?*

Tom. 13. *Pag.* 467

The ſame Author in ſame place ſaies, that Saint *Hierome* durſt not affirm the Aſſumption, but Saint *Auſtine* durſt; and by that meanes, the Church perſwaded by his reaſon believes it: Such a notable Tradition have all her opinions; for even this affirmation, which he confeſſeth, brought in this beliefe, is it ſelf not now believed to be Saint *Auſtines*, for I take it, he muſt mean his tract of the Aſſumption, counted not his, by your own Divinity-Criticks, the *Lovaine* Doctors, which have

ſet

ſet it forth at *Cullen*.

And becauſe I am willing to ſpend no more time in the proofe of ſo apparent a Truth, I will not urge *Poſa*, who, to perſwade the defining of an opinion, which hath a great current of the Ancients againſt it, (ſo farr it is from having any Tradition for it) reckons many other opinions condemned by your Church, and defended by the Ancients, unleſſe you will believe his impudent Aſſertion, that they are all corrupted, and will paſſe to the Concluſion of this, which ſhall have for a Corollary, the Confeſſion of a *Spaniſh* Arch-Biſhop, who is to be thought to ſpeak with more authority then his own, becauſe being imployed to bring that to paſſe, which was deſired by ſo great a Part of your Church, he can ſcarce be ſuppoſed not to have had the advice and conſent of many of them in what he ſayes. *In Elucidar Deiparæ Pag. 1113.*

He then tells us, Firſt, every Age either brings forth, or opens her Truth: Things are done in their times, and ſeverall Doctrines are unlockt in ſeverall Ages. *Wadd. Pag. 125.*

Secondly, To ſhew that though his opinion had no ſuch Tradition as you ſay your Church claimes for all her Doctrines, yet it may, and ought to be defined; he deſires to know who ever taught the Aſſumption of the Virgin, before Saint *Auſtines* and *Hieromes* time, and by whom was that opinion deduct from the Apoſtles: Nay, he abſolutely affirmes, that before *Nazianzene*, no man ever taught any thing of her delivery without paine, yet many thought the contrary. *Pag. 270*

*Pag.*202. Thirdly and laſtly, For your abſolute confutation, he confeſſeth, that we believe and hold in this Age many things for Myſteries of Faith, which in former Ages did waver under ſmall or no Probability, and many Things are now defined for Articles of Faith, which have endured a hard repulſe among the moſt and the weightieſt of the Ancient Doctors, and no light contradiction among the Ancient Fathers; and having reckoned up five Particulars,

The Validity of Hereticks Baptiſme,

The Beatificall Viſion before the day of Judgment,

The Spirituallity of Angels,

The Soules being immediately created, and not ex traduce,

And, The Virgines being free from all actuall Sinne:

*Pag.*203. He ſhuts it up thus, Many of theſe kinds of Opinions there are, which ſometimes declined to one Part, ſometimes to the other, and had contrary Favourers, according to ſeverall times, untill a diligent and long diſquiſition being præmitted, the Truth was manifeſted either by Pope, or Provinciall, or generall Councels, nay, and ſaies that the diſquiſition is made by conferring of Places of Scripture and Reaſon, which is the way which you miſlike.

*Pag.*204. Theſe things conſidered, whoſoever ſhall after ſay, that your Church claimes all her Doctrines to have come by a Verball and conſtant Tradition to her from the Apoſtles, I will not ſay that he is very

very impudent, but I cannot think that a ſmall matter will put him out of countenance; for your part, I eſteeme you ſo much, that I am confident you have not ſo little Noſe as not to find the contrary, nor ſo little Forehead as not to confeſſe it, having received the *Affidavit* of ſuch a cloud of Witneſſes.

Whoſoever pretend Chriſt his Truth againſt her, ſaith, that true it is, ſhe had once had the true way, but by length of times ſhe is fallen into groſſe Errors, which they will reform, not by any Truth which they have received from hand to hand from thoſe, who by both Parts are acknowledged to have received their leſſon from Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, but by Arguments, either out of Ancient Writers, or the ſecrets of Reaſon. Object.

This is no farther true then as it concernes the Proteſtants, for the *Greek* Church will not ſuffer your propoſition to be generall, but forbid the Banes. *Reſp.*

They pretend not to have made any Reformation, but to have kept ever ſince the Apoſtles, what from them was received: *Barlaam* ſaies, they do σώας καὶ ὁλοκλήρους τὰς τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας παραδόσεις φυλάττειν, keep ſafe and whole the Tradition of the Catholique Church, nay, he proves his to be the ſound Part, becauſe by them οὐδὲν ὑγιὲς τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας παραδόσεως νενόμισται παρεμπόδιζον, Nothing was ever more eſteemed then her Tradition: And he objects it to your Church that ſhe doth τὰς τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀθετεῖν, καὶ ταύτας εἰς οὐδὲν δέοντα ξενικά τινα, καὶ ἀλλόκοτα ἀντεισάγειν δόγματα, diſanull the Tradition of the Catholique Church, and ſetting them at naught,

naught, bring in ſtrange and undenizon'd opinions : And that *Greeke*, who is joyned to *Nilus*, and *Barlaam* in *Salmatius* his Edition diſputing againſt a Cardinall, chargeth you, that you do τῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ πατέρων παραδόσει ὥσπερ πείρατι ζιζάνια, ſow Tares among the Tradition of the Apoſtles and Fathers : if when they make this claime they either ſay ſo, and think not ſo, or think ſo, and erre, then this proves, that though the *Roman* Church did make that claime which you ſay ſhe doth, yet ſhe too might either claime it againſt her Conſcience, or againſt Truth : For this claime of the laſt cannot be denyed but by him, who will imitate that *Hamſhire* Clown, of whom you give me warning, and believe no more then he ſees himſelf, eſpecially ſince your own Authors, when they diſpute for Traditions, prove their authority from this profeſſion of the *Greekes* : but I cannot blame you to forget them, (if we would ſuffer you) ſince they cannot be remembred but by your Religions diſadvantage ; For I verily believe, that if they had but one Addition which they want, (I mean Riches) not onely moſt of them who leave the Proteſtants, would ſooner go to them then to you, (unleſſe they would take their Religion as we take Boates, for being the Next) but money among you, who (though they diſlike your pretended Infallibility, that the Popes uſurpations upon the rights of other Biſhops, his (not ancient) claime of power to deliver Soules out of Purgatory, *&c*, And yet are frighted from joyning with the Proteſtants, by want of Succeſſion,

ſion, Vocation, and ſuch like Bull-beggers) would goe over to them (as I have heard *Spalato* meant to doe) if they were not kept, by an unwillingneſſe to change the ſpirituall tyrannie of the Pope, for the temporall of the *Turke*.

But (although there were no ſuch Churches, or they made no ſuch claime, yet having ſhew'd out of your own Authors, that ſome opinions have not been conſtantly delivered by Tradition, but have entered into the Church upon the grounds (which might at leaſt poſſiblie deceive them) of Scripture, Reaſon, and Revelation, and others knockt apace to be let in) I hope we may be excuſed for making a reveiw of all, and examining what doctrines have been brought in, if not by Scripture (which we think reaſonable) at leaſt by comparing what this age teacheth and requires, with what the firſt Ages did; to which we are encourag'd by your ſelves, who make agreement with Antiquitie, the chief mark of the Church, unleſſe you meane your ſelves to be onelie Judges, even of thoſe things by which you bid us to judge you: For our examinations by reaſon, I cannot tell why you miſlike it, ſince thoſe who truſt their own reaſon leaſt, truſt it yet to chuſe for them one whom they may truſt, againſt which, all Arguments drawn from her fallibilitie without queſtion lie. Your Religion is built upon your Church, her authoritie upon reaſons, which we think ſlight and fallacious, and your ſelves think but prudentiall and probable; ought we not then, nay, muſt we not examine them by Rea-

ſon, or receive them upon your word? And allowing them probable reaſon, yet I have ſtill cauſe to examine further, whether your ſuperſtructions be not more unreaſonable then your foundations are reaſonable, for then I cannot receive a more unprobable doctrine, then that is probable, which it is prov'd by: Yet (in reſpect of things appearing divers, at divers times) I doe not like my own way ſo well, as to eſteem it abſolutelie infallible, but though I keep it, becauſe I account it the beſt, yet I will promiſe to leave it, when you can ſhew me a better, which will be hard to doe, becauſe you cannot prove it to be better but by reaſon, againſt which proofe (and conſequentlie againſt whatſoever it proves) your own Objections remaine; For to be perſwaded by reaſon, that to ſuch an authoritie I ought to ſubmit it, is ſtill to follow reaſon, and not to quit her. And by what elſe is it, that you examine what the Apoſtles taught, when you examine that by ancient Tradition, and ancient Tradition by a preſent Teſtimonie? Yet when I ſpeake thus of finding the Truth by Reaſon, I intend not to exclude the Grace of God, which I doubt not (for as much as is neceſſarie to Salvation) is readie to concurre to our Inſtruction, as the Sunne is to our ſight, if we by a wilfull winking chuſe not to make, not it, but our ſelves guilty of our blindneſſe: Indeed if we love darkneſſe better then light, and inſtead of eſteeming it, ſhut it out, it were but juſt in God, if we ſo continue long hardened, not to ſuffer it to ſee after when

we

we would, ſince ſo obſtinatelie we would not when we might, like to that which happened to thoſe Engliſhmen, of whom *Froiſſard* ſpeakes, who having long bound up an eye, and made a fooliſh vow, never to ſee with that till they could ſee their Miſtreſſes, when they returned, and unbound them, they ſaw nothing, but that they could not ſee.

Yet when I ſpeake of Gods grace, I mean not, that it infuſeth a knowledge without reaſon, but workes by it, as by its Miniſter, and diſpels thoſe Miſts of Paſſions, which doe wrap up Truth from our Underſtandings. For if you ſpeake of its inſtructing any other way, though I confeſſe it is poſſible (as God may give us a ſixth ſence) yet it is not ordinarie, and ought not to be brought to diſpute, becauſe ſo we leave viſible Arguments to flie to inviſible, and your Adverſarie, when he hath found your play, will be ſoon at the ſame locke, and I beleeve in this ſence, infus'd Faith is but the ſame thing, otherwiſe apparell'd, which you have ſo often laught at in the *Puritans*, under the title of private Spirit.

This being ſuppoſed, either this Principle hath remain'd unto her ever ſince her beginning, or ſhe took it up in ſome one Age of the ſixteen, if ſhe took it up, ſhe then thought, ſhe had nothing in her, but what ſhe had receiv'd from her fore-fathers, and if ſhe thought ſo, ſhe knew it. Object.

This Principle is not yet taken up by her, and ſuppoſe it were, yet ſince ſome other opinions are confeſs'd to have been receiv'd by her, not from *Reſp.*

a constant Tradition, but Scripture, and Revelations, and not at once, but by little and little, this very Principle of receiving nothing but from Tradition, might it selfe have been receiv'd not from Tradition: nor need it have been in any one Age of the sixteen, but some might have taught it in one Age, more in another, and all at last, and this so farre from being an impossibilitie, that it were no wonder.

Object. *Let us adde, that the multitude of this Church is so dispersed through so many Countries, and Languages, that it is impossible they should agree together upon a false Determination, to affirme with one consent a Falsity for Truth, no Interest being able to be common to them all, to produce such an effect.*

Resp. Although so many Countries could not so well agree upon it at once, yet some might so perswade others, that in time and by degrees the disease may be grown epidemicall: And trulie, considering in everie Countrie how few there are, who thinke of Religion at all, or of them againe, who walke in it by the directions of their owne eyes, even of them who take upon them to shew that way to others, but for the most part (which they did much more in more ignorant times, when *Scriptura sacra cum vetustis authoribus frigebat*) are lead by some few, whom they reverence for their Piety and learning, ὧν λόγους ἀκριτῶς ὑπολαμβάνουσι νόμους, whose words are accounted lawes, and they againe by a *Thomas*, or a *Scot*, or at best by *Austine*, or *Hierome*, and thinke it Tradition enough

enough to have it from them (for elſe why thinke they to beare us downe with the Authoritie of one or two Fathers, if they thinke that not ground enough to goe upon themſelves) it ſeemes little ſtranger to me, that whole Countries ſhould let in not ancient opinions, then that a few ſhould, ſince a few in all places have ever govern'd all the reſt; of this I will bring two very known examples out of the Eccleſiaſticall Hiſtorie.

The firſt is of *Valens* the Emperour, who, being himſelfe an *Arrian*, and making peace with a Nation which was not ſo, and ſuppoſing that they would never have firme concord with him, to whom in Faith he was ſo oppoſite, was adviſed to perſwade their Biſhop to change his beleife, for which end having employ'd both words and money, and effected it, the Biſhop, directlie contrarie to Saint *Peter*, being himſelfe weakened, weakened his brethren, who yeelded to communicate with the *Arrians* (which before they abhorr'd from) and to eſteeme the Father greater then the Sonne. *Theodoret lib 4.*

The ſecond, is of that *Macedonian* Biſhop, who, being perſecuted by the Catholique Biſhop of the ſame place (who was then gone to *Conſtantinople* to fetch Souldiers, by whoſe aſſiſtance he might afflict the Hereticks the more) reſolved to turne Catholicke, and perſwaded all his followers to joyne with him in that Act, and this in ſo ſhort a time, that when the other returned, he found him choſen Biſhop unanimouſlie by both Parties, and himſelfe (for his crulelty,

not undeſervedlie) excluded.

There is beſides another thing which helpes to lett in great errors, which is, that men naturally neglect ſmall things, and ſmall things in time naturally beget great; for which cauſe *Ariſtotle* ſhewing to us ſeverall cauſes of the Changes of Government, one of them is διὰ τὸ παρέμικρον, adding, that πολλάκις λανθάνει μεγάλη μεταβασις τῶν νομίμων, ὅταν παρρῶσι τὸ μίκρον, often a great chang comes ſtealingly in, whenwhat is little is not conſidered.

Yet beſides the generall careleſſneſſe; The Authority of the Teachers, the Flexibility of the Taught, and the ſmallneſſe of the Things themſelves at the beginning, even Intereſt it ſelfe (which conſiſts of two Parts, Feares, and Hopes) is able to produce great effects: Of this me thinkes your ſelves may be witneſſes, who uſe to call ours, a *Parliamentary Religion*, as thinking, that the Will of the Prince, and both Houſes, onely made it to be received: Whereas in the beginning of Queene *Elizabeths* Raigne, of many thouſaud Livings which were in *England*, the Incumbents of not a hundred, choſe rather to loſe their Benefices for your opinions, then to keepe them by ſubſcribing to ours; all who (for the greateſt Part) of neceſſity muſt be ſuppoſed for private intereſt, to have diſſembled their Religion, either then or immediately before.

Secondly, In the Third Booke of *Evagrius* we find, that above five hundred Biſhops ſubſcribed againſt the Councell of *Calcedon*, which we have reaſon to think moſt did unwillingly, (eſpecially

cially if the Infallibility of a generall Councel were ſo famous a Doctrine for Catholiques as now it is) becauſe we know it was upon *Baſiliſcus* his commands, and that a conſiderable Part of them (the Biſhops of *Aſia*) profeſs'd after they were forct to it, though before they had been very angry in another Epiſtle with thoſe, who ſaid that they had done by force, rather then Free-will.

And over, and above all this we may ſee by *Eraſmus* his words, that many might not oppoſe a Doctrine brought in by great Power, in hope of a time to do it in, when there might be more likelyhood of prevailing: For he ſaith in one place of his Epiſtles, that thoſe who reſiſt opinions, when there is no probable meanes of doing good by it, are like thoſe, who out of ſeaſon attempt to break Priſon, who gaines nothing by it, but to have their Irons doubled upon them: And the ſame cauſe which he thinks ſhould move them to ſtay (outwardly) contentedly in Priſon, may have made many others not reſiſt, when they were firſt by violence and crowd carried thither, who might feare leaſt their oppoſall might not help their cauſe, but beget a definition againſt it. And there being thus many ſeverall motives which may work upon ſo many ſeverall kindes of men, it is no wonder, if an error may ſoon over-runne all men, or ſeem to do ſo.

Next, Whereas you ſpeak of ſeverall Countries, and Languages, I muſt deſire you to remember, that the Clergy of your Church are as it were all of one Language, (*Latine* either being, or

being ſuppoſed to be, as much theirs, as that of their own People) and being under the Dominion of one, that is the Pope, which makes them as it were one Country, and from them the Laity receive all their opinions: Nay in ancient times almoſt all conſiderable men ſpoke the Language of the governing Nation, (as all of the better ſort of the *Iriſh* do *Engliſh*) and the greateſt part of Chriſtians were governed by one man, the Emperour, and ſo a new opinion may eaſily have been received generally, no ſuch barres being ſet up to hinder it, as you alleadge.

Object. *Chriſtian Doctrine is not a ſpeculative knowledge inſtituted for delight, but it is an Art of living, a Rule of attaining to eternall bliſſe; hence it followeth, that no error can fall, even in a point which ſeemeth wholly ſpeculative in Chriſtian Faith, but ſoon it breedeth a Practicall effect, or rather defection in Chriſtian behaviour.*

Reſp. I wonder much to heare you ſay this, who certainely have a Religion conſiſting of many points, which are no wayes reduced into Practice: Eſpecially from the degrees in which they are held, (which I conceive introduced) could ariſe no change in Chriſtian behaviour; I confeſſe that Chriſtian Religion being a Covenant between God, and Man by the entermiſe of Chriſt, we Chriſtians are properly concerned, but in the knowledge of what are the Conditions and Reward propoſed and promiſed, what wee are to obſerve, and what to hope for; and in ſo farre forth underſtanding the Nature and Attributes of

of the Covenant-maker and bringer, as we may be made ſure, that whatſoever God hath promiſed or threatened, that indeed he hath: But though this principally concernes us, yet the neceſſity of beleeving the veracity of God, obligeth us moreover to give our Aſſents to any thing, how little ſoever it have to doe with practiſe (as Saint *Pauls* having Parchments) if it be once made to appeare to us either by Scripture-reaſon, Tradition, or any way to have been ſaid by God either immediately, or mediately by Chriſt and his Apoſtles: And do not your ſelves count the *Greekes* Heretickes for denying the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from the Son, (though many Fathers deny it too) though, I pray, what hath that to do with Practice or Chriſtian behaviour, and if you ſhould now change your opinion in this point, what outward change would it breed, except onely the blotting out of one clauſe in a Creed in your Liturgy, wherein it was not at firſt? And not ſo much outward change would there be, if you ſhould turne to believe *Enoch* and *Elias*, not bo be ſtill alive, the contrary to which *Belarmine* ſaies all Catholiques hold now with a certaine Faith: And many more are of this kind.

Cap. 6 Lib. 3 de Romano Pontifice.

Object.

Whether man have Free-will or no, ſeemeth a Queſtion belonging to ſome curious Philoſopher; but upon the Preaching of the Negative part, preſently followed an unknown Libertinage, men yeelding themſelves over to all kind of Concupiſcence, ſince they were perſwaded they had no power to reſiſt, Free-

will being taken away.

Resp. At this time it is not my own cause which I plead, Ἐνταῦθα ἂν ἧττον γίγνομαι ἄτε ὰ τὰ ἐμαυτῦ κατασκευάζων, since in this point I confesse, I should rather be a *Pelagian*, then a *Calvinist*, since the first doth not wholly overthrow Gods grace, (for whatever we have by Nature, His grace gives us) but the second wholly overthrowes His justice, besides the direct contrariety of their Doctrine to Scripture, they saying in effect, that the Kingdome of Heaven is to take us by violence, whereas that teaches us, that we are to take it so: But yet give me leave to say thus much for them, that though it be true, that ill life followes very consequently from that Principle, and those who hold it, must be ill *Logicians*, if they be good men, yet it is plaine, that very many of them live as good lives, as any who believe the contrary.

Besides, this in my opinion concernes as neerely your *Dominicans*, as our *Calvinists*, since they use Free-will, as *Tully* saith *Epicurus* did the Gods, *verbis asserunt, re negant*, assert it in words, but deny it in deed; yet I think you will not say that they are the more licentious, for (by direct consequence) denying Liberty; If therefore an opinion, which is so neerely tyed to action, produce no more effects, how much fewer would those other so much more unconcerning Tenets bring forth?

Object. *I need not instance in Prayer to Saints, worshipping Images, Prayer for the Dead* &c. *which it is evident could not be changed without an apparent change*

change in Christian Churches.

Without change (which though it must be then apparent, yet need it not be so to us) I confesse they could not come in, but with little opposition they might: The doubtfull estate of the dead after this life, before the day of *Judgment-audit*, being much better that they should have our Prayers, though they want them not, then misse of them if they want them, may not unlikely (and peradventure not unreasonably) have brought in that Custome without either giving scandale, or being received by Tradition; Though if it had, you would have gotten little by it, for unlesse such a Purgatory, out of which Indulgences may deliver, will follow out of it, the Pope will not care for the other, as being οὐδὲν πρὸς τὰ ἄλφιτα, nothing to profit: And though he did establish a Purgatory, yet it might be one after the Resurrection, for such a one, more then one Father speakes off: But it need establish none, (no not any third place, which is lesse) for the Prayers might be first intended for the encrease of the happinesse of the Blessed, and relaxation of the torment of the Cursed, which latter effect, that the Prayers for the dead have, is said by *Prudentius*, and confess'd to have been said, both by him, and others, by your own *Heroe*, Cardinall *Perron*. *Resp.* *Lib. Con. Reg. Iac. Pag. 892.*

Of the worship of Images I shall speake hereafter.

Praying to Saints may have come in upon consequences drawne out of mistaken places of Scriptures, or others, which inducing the opinion, that

that they enjoy'd the beatificall vision before the day of judgement, some might conclude, that then they saw all in it, and at first pray to them but conditionallie, till their number increased, and with it the degree in which they held the opinion, till now to deny it is accounted Heresie, though I know no Father which justifies our invocating of them (although they speake of their interceding for us) before *Nazianzene*, whose example alone being of so great authoritie might spread it much: though, I pray, remember, who (as saies *Nicephorus Calistus*) it was that brought it first into the publick Liturgie.

Object. *It is not possible, that any materiall point of Christian Faith can be changed, as it were, by obreption, whilst men are on sleep, but it must needs raise a great scandall, and tumult: For suppose the Apostles had taught the world it were Idolatry to pray to Saints, or use reverence to their Pictures, how can we imagine this honour brought in but by a vehement conflict and tumult in a people, which did so greatly abhorre Idolatry, as the Apostles and Disciples did.*

Resp. Ἅμας ἀπήτων οἱ δ' ἀπηρνοῦντο σκάφας: I spoke cheiflie, not of changing a point of Faith, but of creating one, not of contradicting a doctrine delivered from the Apostles, but of introducing one, of which they were wholly silent, either as theirs at first (as yee must say *Pappias* did) or onely as True, till being rooted and spread, it be beleeved Apostolicall upon *Tertullian*'s Argument, that else how could so many Churches, *errare in unam fidem,*

fidem, erre into the ſame beleife, which (becauſe leſſe time had then been allowed error to diſperſe it ſelfe in) was then, though no concluding proofe, yet a better then it was the next Age, and ſo ſtill grew the worſe for the wearing, till now it is worth juſt nothing.

But as *Himerius* ſaith, ῥᾶστον ἀπολογεῖσθαι περὶ ὧν οὐ φεύγει τὶς δίκας, I ſay, tis moſt eaſie to anſwer that which is not imputed, for I am ſo farre from ſaying that the Apoſtles taught theſe two things to be Idolatrie (ſince on my Conſcience they ſpake not of them directlie at all) that I my ſelfe will not ſay they are. For Prayer to Saints (ſet aſide your Idolatrie-like Expreſſions, ſeeming to beg that of them, which you profeſſe, you meane onely to have them beg for you) I ſuppoſe the Queſtion to be but this, whether they heare us or no (which Martyrs might poſſiblie doe, and yet no other, how holy and canoniz'd ſoever, becauſe many Fathers held that none elſe ſee God yet) If they doe, I beleeve you may as well (or better, becauſe you are more ſure of their being in favour with God) deſire them to intercede for you, as you may deſire the Prayers of any living Friend, but if they doe not, then I will not ſay in *Chryſoſtomes* phraſe, πόσων οὐκ ἄξια ταῦτα σκήπτων, what Thunder-bolts doth it not deſerve, but how unreaſonable is it to caſt men out of the Church, and ſend them out of the world, for not aſſenting to an opinion, which you cannot prove.

For reverence to the Pictures of Saints, if you

meane onely ſome outward civill reſpect, to teſtifie the great honour and love which you beare the Prototypes, It is, I beleeve, no more Idolatrie, then keeping off our hats in the Preſence-Chamber to the Cloth of Eſtate.

Yet this I am ſo farre from eſteeming neceſſarie, that I thinke they had better never come in, then have occaſion'd ſo much un-chriſtian turmoile about ſo indifferent a thing. The firſt and pureſt Ages did well enough without theſe Pictures (we heare onely of a Parabolicall one of Chriſt in a Chalice) after they came to be made, after to be ſet in Churches, after to be prayed before, nay, at laſt they are come to ſo great an exceſſe, that not onely againſt Scripture, but all Antiquitie, they are now come to picture God the Father himſelfe: Upon a Popes Letter to an Emperour, wherein he defends the picturing of Saints and Chriſt, and ſpeakes improbablie of the Antiquitie of their Pictures, and addes the reaſon why they pictured not God the Father, *Baronius* ſaies in the Margent. Yet it hath after happened, that they pictured him as he hath appeared; a way which the Church of that time could eaſily have found out, had they thought it lawfull, as it is plaine Saint *Auſtine* did not, unleſſe *Nefas eſt* be an Approbation: This alone may ſerve to ſhew that beleifes may come in, even contrarie to that of former time (and yet we not know when they entered) unleſſe you will oppoſe a ſuperficiall reaſon, that a thing cannot be to a plaine example that it is, and force me to anſwer with *Barlaam*,

Tertul.

De fide & Symb.

vexpo

νεκρὸν βλέπω, λέγεις μοι ὅτι ἀδύνατον ἀποθανεῖν, you tell me, it is impoſſible for him to die, whoſe Corſe I look upon.

We remember in a manner as yet, how change came into Germanie, France, Scotland, *and our own Country, let theſe be a ſigne to us, what we may think can be the creeping in of falſe doctrine.* Object.

This is but a continuance of the ſame Paralogiſme: For at this time, in theſe places, a ſetled Religion being contradicted, the caſe is very different from an Opinions prevailing in the mindes of men, when they were yet white Paper, and not filled with any doctrine to the contrarie, either becauſe though once the contrarie had been taught, yet it had ſlept a good while, or becauſe nothing had before been ſpoken concerning it: We know, that nothing makes Noiſe but Oppoſition and Reſiſtance, and if that be not much, it will not laſt long, and the memorie of it as little: Beſides moſt of theſe points making for the power and wealth of the Clergie, you muſt not expect, that there ſhould have been as great an out-crie and hubbub when they were introduced at firſt, as when expelled after long prevailing, it being a worke, both more ſhort, eaſie, and ſecret to plant an Acorne, then to cut down or remove an Oake (χαλεπὸν γὰρ γεγενδρυον μεταφυτεύειν) although thoſe men which governe the reſt, were not in this caſe ſo much intereſſed. *Reſp.*

There is no point of doctrine contrary to the Catholicke Church rooted in any Chriſtian Nation, that the Eccleſiaſticall Hiſtory doth not mention, the times Object.

and combats, by which it entered, and tore the Church in peices.

Resp. The combats wherein it tore the Church, peradventure it doth, but of the times wherein many entered, they are altogether silent. All take notice of *Arrius* his words, when by reason of *Alexander*'s hot opposition there grew divisions, but of what the Orthodox-counted Authors (which we have) before the Councell of *Nice* said (though aske *Perron*, and he will tell you, how like *Arrianisme* they look) no Ecclesiasticall Historie makes any mention, because they made no bounce like the other, and so in likelihood tooke no more notice of other opinions, which made none neither. And what is said of this point, may be said of *Eutychianisme* (see the same place of *Perron*) for we know how *Dioscorus* called upon the Fathers of the *Pelagians*, and others, whose opinions were certainlie in the Church before them, who are now counted the Authors of them.

Nay, even of opinions rooted (as you call it) are not the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the the Father onely, the communicating Infants, the admitting none to the Beatificall Vision but Martyrs, and other such rooted in the *Greeke* Church? or can yon tell when they entered? at least was it not long before any combat concerning them? But suppose this were true, it is but accidentally so, for some of those writings which deliver this to us, might as well have been lost, as many others which were, so that no man can conclud that, of whatsoever,

ever no beginning can be ſhewed in Eccleſiaſticall ſtory, that hath not been introduced, (eſpecially ſince I ſpeak not ſo much of opinions oppoſing the Ancient Tradition, as of Superfætations, not onely of pointes indeed Materiall, but of ſuch as in continuance of time, have grown to be thougt ſo) for how can I tell, many of them having been loſt, but ſome of thoſe would have given me notice of it, if I now had them.

Let it therefore remaine for evidently conſtant, that into the Chriſtian Church can come no Errors, but it muſt be ſeen and noted, and raiſe ſcandale and oppoſition. Object.

Here Sir not onely αἰξ ὄπω τέτοκεν, ἔριφος δ' ἐπὶ δώγματα παίζει, you reſolve upon a Truth of a concluſion before you have proved the Premiſſes; but even that is ſuch a one as followes not out of them, although they were granted: For how followes it, that becauſe all heretofore have been noted, therefore all at all times muſt be ſo, nay, that though at the comming in they found ſcandale and oppoſition, we neceſſarily (many centuries after) muſt know they did ſo. For the knowledge, which we have of theſe things, is but *Reliquiæ Danaum*, what was overſeen by the zeale and negligence, and how much we want of what we might have known, had the reſt ſcap'd, no man can tell who pretends not to Revelation, and to the ability of knowing what was in Books, whereof he never ſaw any, and never heard of moſt: But though it followes not, ſuch a thing hath been done, therefore it muſt ever be, yet it followes (in ſpite of the *Reſp.*

the moſt ſevere exception) ſuch a thing hath been done, therefore it may be; As for example, ſince *Valentinian* the Emperour bringing in ſo contrary to Chriſtian Religion, as you will confeſſe *Polygamy* to be, and eſtabliſhing it with a law which allowed it, and yet thoſe who tels us both of his actions and his Edict, ſpeaking no tittle of any oppoſition which was made to it, but he ever accounted a very good and pious Emperour, and his Son by his ſecond wife (his firſt ſtill living, and undivorced from him) being eſteemed Legitimate, and ſucceeding him in a part of his Empire; think you whether his authority could not have drawn the Principall men, (and incluſively the reſt to ſubſcribe almoſt any opinion, who could keep them from oppoſing ſuch an Act, or ſuch a Law: And if though this be now counted unlawfull, yet we find not, that either any Biſhop adviſed him againſt it, or excommunicated him for it, or indeed any man diſliked it: If any falſe opinion backt by great Power, have been not onely (like this) introduced, but ſpread and ſetled, how unlikely is it that we ſhould now know what ſcandals it raiſed, ſuppoſing it raiſed any.

Object. *As in our Naturall Body, the Principall parts are defended by bones, fleſh, skins, and other defences, that no outward Agent can come to offend there, before having annoyed ſome of theſe; ſo in the Catholique Faith, there are in ſpeculations, thoſe which we call Theologicall Concluſions, and other pious opinions, and in practice, many rights and ceremonies, which ſtoppe the Paſſage unto the maine Principall*

Parts

Parts of Christian beliefe, and Actions.

Either these Theologicall conclusions, and pious opinions are derived from the same Tradition, or they are not; if they be, then sure they are equally matters of Faith, and so need some other course to defend them, and you must find *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes*: If they be not, but were onely Deductions either of the first Ages Logick, (which was not alwaies excellent) or of that of more Modern times, then may they so easily be false themselves, that I know not how they can serve to preserve the rest certainly from all corruption indeed to secure any Truth: But I believe many may be miscounted Hereticks, for onely opposing some of these, what through the over-caution, and too much ardor of some *Primum mobile*, and of the greater part lead by a few such, what through their being come (having been long) from pious opinions, to be matters of Faith, as in great Families Servants, who haue waited long in meaner places, are rewarded with higher: Besides I verily believe, that many Doctrines, which you account necessary, have no such redoubts about them, or at least have not alwaies had, and indeed you onely affirming it by *Tullies* Rule, (who was no small Master of Reason) *Sat erit verbo negare*, It will be enough for me barelie to deny it. And for Rites and Ceremonies which you suppose guard your Doctrines, (many used among the Ancients being not now in use amonst you) either some Tenets, which those did guard, and they did hold, yee hold not; or if you do still, at least they are now unguarded.

Resp.

But

But ſtill, I ſpeaking moſt of the eaſineſſe, that falſe and new Doctrines not contradicting the old, may be brought into the Church, what anſwer is it to tell me, how the Principall of Chriſtian Religion are ſure guarded, ſince ſo they may be, and yet ſuch other may be brought in: As Chriſts Promiſes, and chiefe injunctions may be retained, and yet praying to Saints, and Purgatory, and ſuch like, be ſuperinduct.

Object. *Let any diſcreete man conſider, what further evidence he can deſire, or peradventure what greater aſſurance Nature can afford.*

Reſp. Sir, I wiſh you ſo well that I cannot but give you warning, that this ſaying of yours doth *Sapere Hæreſin*, ſince it ſeemes as if you diſclaimed any abſolute Infallibility, and pretend onely to grounds of moſt poſſibility, which the Proteſtants doing too, uſe yet to be accuſed for making nothing certaine, and having no firm foundation to build any thing upon: But as you claime leſſe, then by your own Rules you ſhould, ſo you claim ſtill more, then either you are able to prove, or we likely to grant.

Object. *The Philoſophers ſay, it is* indiſciplinati ingenii, *to expect in any Science more exactneſſe then the Nature of it affords.*

Reſp. I confeſſe this to be true, but I deſire you alſo to remember, that as it is abſurd to expect as exact a proof in the Politicks, as in Geometry, ſo it is abſurd to expect as high a degree of Aſſent to the firſt, as to the ſecond of my objections, being intended againſt thoſe, who will be infalliblly believed to be infallible upon probable grounds, for they

they themſelves give them no higher a Title, and indeed that it ſelf in my opinion, is more then they deſerve.

What ſhall we expect then in Religion, to ſee a main advantage on the one Party we caſt our ſelves upon. Object.

Truely ſuch Advantage on your part I cannot ſee: Neither if I did, could I in reaſon joyn with you. A maine advantage it is to have more Truth then any other Society of Chriſtians, but ſuppoſing you had ſo (which is but a ſuppoſition, for I verily believe, if the Queſton were but, who had moſt Title to ſo much, yee would appear to a diſpaſſionate man, οὐ τρίτοι, οὐδὲ τέταρτοι, Neither third nor fourth, according to the anſwer of the Ancient Oracle) yet you withall require, not onely that I ſhould believe you erre in nothing, but that you never can, and then I had rather remaine in their communion, I ſay not, who themſelves erred not, but whoſe conditions of Communion were leſſe rigorous, and exacted not of me to profeſſe they could not erre, when I believe they do. And if you anſwer, that it would neceſſarily follow, that if they had feweſt errors, they muſt have none, becauſe ſome ſociety of Chriſtians muſt be allwaies free from all this; I ſhall abſolutely deny, and the more earneſtly, becauſe I know this is a trappe, wherein many have been caught, who taking this for granted, have examined the Doctrines of the moſt known Churches of Proteſtants, and finding (as they thought, and peradventure truely) ſome errors in them, ſome Doctrines no way to be proved but upon Popiſh grounds, and by that juſti- *Reſp.*

fying thoſe, and ſome imputations impoſed upon their Adverſaries, wherein their Tenets, or the conſequences from them were miſtaken, they then by the Doggs Logick have run over, without ſmelling to the Church of *Rome*, as knowing no other Society but theſe, and being præpoſſeſt, that one of neceſſity muſt be free from all error: Whereas for my part, as the ἐκλέκτικοι, thoſe who bound not themſelves to believe abſolutely the whole Doctrines of any Sect, but pickt out what they thought accorded with reaſon out of them all, were a wiſe ſort of Philoſophers, ſo they ſeem to me reaſonable Divines, who ſpeak Gods will as they did Truth, (for it is not to chuſe by reaſon, and Scripture or Tradition received by Reaſon, which makes a Hereticke, but to chuſe an opinion which will make moſt either for the chuſers Luſt, or Power and Fame, and then ſeeking waies how to entitle God to it) For ſince it would be a Miracle, if the Errors of the *Roman* Church being long gathering could have been all diſcovered in a Day, or if it had been poſſible for the firſt Reformers, (who having their eyes but newly open, it is not ſtrange if (like the man in the Goſpel) they ſaw at firſt men walking like Trees, and had but an imperfect apprehenſion of Truth, eſpecially being in *Tullies* ſtate *Quem fugio habeo, Quem ſequar non habeo.* I ſee whom to fly, but not whom to follow, not to have left ſome opinions untaxt, which yet were errors, nor to have expurged others, which yet were none; I cannot ſee why we may not in ſome points joyn with the one, and with others in other,

and

and besides find some Truths which ly ἐν μέσα ἰχμίῳ, well in the mid-way betweene the Parties, ἀφαιροῦντες ἑκατέρων τὴν ὑπερβολὴν, nay in some points differ wholly from both : Which Liberty, if it were generally allowed, and generally practised, if particular interests were trod wholly under foot, especially by the greatest, and if such spirits as those of *Cassander* and *Melancton* were more common, no considerable things would in a short time be left, but all would flow againe in the same Chanell, whereas this opinion, that allwaies one part erres not, is both prejudiciall to Truth, and the best Unity, which is, that of Charity, for it perswades them who have fewest errors, to believe those to be none, and to hate all opposers as Hereticks; and of this your Church is most guilty, which not onely affirmes that there is such a one, but that she is it, and prophesies as much of her selfe allwaies for the future, as she promiseth for the present, and upon this ground (like him who having won nineteene games at Tables, threw the Dice in the fire for not winning him the twentieth) though we should yeeld to her in all points but one, and that the least considerable, she would yet throw us into the fire as Hereticks, for dissenting from her in that.

You are bidden to put what yeare, or age, such an error entered, and it is evidently true, that then that yeare, or age, the Church conspired to tell a lie, and deceive their Posterity. Object.

You would never be loved, if you were a Poser, and used to aske such hard questions, for either you must mean by [an opinion entering] when first *Resp.*

any man poſſeſſed it, or when firſt by all in communion with your Church it was aſſented unto: If you mean the firſt, it is impoſſible to be anſwered; for if one ſhould ask, who taught firſt that Chriſt was not begotten by God, before he was conceived by the Virgin *Mary*, (through his power and the over-ſhadowing of the Holy Ghoſt) one who knew little of Antiquity, would anſwer *Socinus*, a more learned Perſon would ſay *Photinus*, another *Paulus Samoſatenus*, another might find before him, *Artemon* and another yet before him, *Theodorus* οκυτὺς, (with whom curious Logicians, and great Readers of *Euclid*, *Ariſtotle*, *Galen*, and *Theophraſtus* were joyned) and yet that he was the firſt we have no certainty, for if a little of *Euſebius* had been loſt, *Theodorus*, and *Artemon* had not been now heard of, which may as well have happened to others before them, either by want of being taken notice of by an Hiſtorian, or by the loſſe of the Hiſtory, and not onely is this ſo in this, but in all other points.

If you mean the ſecond, (for ſo you muſt by your Inference, though the words of the Queſtion will bear both ſences) it is as impoſſible for you to receive an anſwer. For how ſhall I know when all it is granted? For ſuppoſe no Author to have been loſt, and me to have read and remembred them all, yet (as in *England* when the *Calviniſts* opinion prevailed moſt, as wiſe and learned men, as thoſe who writ, though differing in opinion from the Authors, yet opposed them not ſo publiquely, but that many might believe the more generall

nerall Tenet to be received by all) how ſhould I know that the opinions of the Authors of ſeverall Ages, did agree with that of all equally wiſe and learned in the ſame times, for if there be no greater certaintie of the opinions of all of one Kingdome in our owne Age, think what Infallibilitie can we have concerning an abſolute generall conſent a thouſand years agoe. And of this, *France* may as well be an example as *England*, wherein many called *Caſſandrians*, diſſent from the publiquely received Doctrines, though with ſo little ſtirr, that our Poſterity will not know that there now are ſuch; So that all which any man can anſwer to this Queſtion, is, that ſuch a one was the firſt that he knowes of, who taught ſuch a Doctrine, and ſuch a time the firſt, wherein he knowes not that any contradicted it, or that your Church defines it for a neceſſary opinion, and exacted aſſent to it, as a condition of their Communion; which anſwer will be nearer to Truth or Falſhood, according to the meaſure of the anſwerers learning; And indeed if you pleaſe to remember, that when learning roſe againe, and the Reformation began, moſt *Manuſcripts* of conſiderable Books, had long layn unreguarded by the generallity in Popiſh Libraries, and out of them onely had ſome few been Printed, you muſt confeſſe, that it was in the power of your Church, what anſwer we ſhould be able to make to that Queſtion which you propoſe, which then it is no wonder if it were not anſwered, for your willingneſſe to keep men in darkneſſe concerning this, even

even in times of moſt light, is to be ſeen by your expurgatory Indexes: For there, though you profeſſe to meddle with none but Moderne Authors, (whereas it is plaine you go as high as *Bertram*) yet both that will ſerve to deceive our poſterity concerning the generall opinions of theſe times, and if your Church in former Ages uſed any courſe ſomewhat Analogicall to this, upon thoſe Authors who then were moderne too, (as likely enough they did, or you have cauſe to hope they did for your more juſtification) then how can I know when any opinion entered, that is, either firſt was at all, or firſt by all taught: ſince in all times (how little mention ſoever be made of it) there may have been ſome Doctors of that opinion, though either no Authors, or allthough Authors, yet by this Stratageme may be kept from us.

Neither indeed can you anſwer this Queſtion your ſelf, for you know not in what Year, or Age, did either the giving the *Euchariſt* to Infants begin, or end, at leaſt Saint *Auſtine* knew not the firſt, who believed it an Apoſtolical Tradition: Neither was this a bare Cuſtome, but implyed an opinion of good which Children received, which the change ſhewes plainely to have altered, and certainely either the firſt opinion was a Superſtition, or the latter a Sacriledge.

But howſoever your Conſequence followes not, for though your Church conſpired, and deceived their Poſterity, yet it might not conſpire to deceive their Poſterity, but to inſtruct it, being themſelves deceived. And therefore when you reckon

reckon up the Motives which men have to ſpeak falſe, I wonder to ſee Hopes, and Feares put in, and error left out.

It is Gods courſe deeplier to root and ſtrengthen thoſe things which he would have moſt flouriſh. Now Chriſtians know, that he made mankind for his Elect, the world for mankind, and therefore he hath rooted thoſe things, which more immediately belong to his Elect (as his Church, Faith, and Holy Spirit in it) then the principles either of mans nature or of the world, which was made for it, himſelfe aſſuring us of it, when he told us, That one tittle ſhould not periſh of the holy Writ, though Heaven and Earth ſhould be diſſolved, *and ſo ſeeing the latter principle relyeth upon the not failing of God to his Church, which ſhould ever watch upon their actions, that nothing ſhould creepe into Chriſtian life, which preſently the Zeale of the faithfull ſhould not ſtartle at. I thinke it needleſſe, to ſeeke further to qualifie the ſtrength of that part, which receiveth it from the quality of ſo good a workman as the Holy Ghoſt.* Object.

Ἀρχὴ παιδεύσεως ἡ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐπίσκεψις, I muſt therefore obſerve, that this word [Church] hath ſo many ſignifications even among your ſelves, that it ſeldome comes into the mouth of a *Romane* Arguer, but there comes withall, foure Termes into his Sillogiſme, I could wiſh therefore, that you would ſtill ſet downe your Definition of it, and put that (inſtead of the word Church) into what you ſay, leaſt what your late *Gracian* Defender *Cariophilus* ſaies of Hereticks, οἰδίποδος ἡμῖν δεῖ Resp.

πρὸς

πρὸς τὰ τῶν καλβινιστῶν αἰνίγματα, ἴδιον δὲ μαλιστὰ τοῦτο συμπάντων τῶν αἱρετικῶν, πάντες ἀσαφείᾳ χαίρουσιν ὡμωνύμοις καὶ ἀμφιβόλοις, that they delight in doubtfull expressions, may seem more properly to belong to you: Certainlie in some sence the Elect are Gods Church, and in that sence, the Church belongs not to his Elect, but is it, neither indeed know I (define it as you please) how it doth, since you confesse, that men may oppose any companie of men, whomsoever you will call the Church, without being obstinate, or consequentlie by heresie excluded from Heaven, and so may, for all that, be elected. Neither indeed know I, how God hath made mankinde for his Elect: It is true, that having elected those who shall persevere in Faith and Obedience, and given man Free-will, which (joyned with Grace universallie offered) might bring him to the condition, and in that to election, and by that to Heaven; God may be said, to have made mankinde for his elect, that is, to be his elect, if they shut not themselves out of the way to be so; And all men (especiallie Christians) I beleeve have, and alwaies shall have meanes enough to performe these conditions, in such a measure (all things considered, I meane, either naturall defects, as in Ideots, never having heard of Christ, as in many Pagans, not having Christs will sufficientlie proposed, as in many Christians, and whosoever is not by some fault in his will hindered from assenting, to him it is not proposed sufficientlie) as shall by God be from them required.

But

But this hinders not, but that all Christians may see what they should, if they stand not in their own light, or wilfullie winke, and if they neglect Christs Instructions or Commands, and make themselves deafe against his voice, charme he never so wiselie, they then may fall from necessarie Truths (much more from others) unto error, as well as from good life into wickednesse, from which, without question, Gods Spirit is as readie to keep men that will be kept, as from the other, and which is no lesse (if not more) part of the conditions required (for in that epitomie, which Christ hath given us of the day of judgement, men are onely mentioned to be punished for want of Charitie, and not mis-interpretations of doctrine) though I grieve to see so many of all parts (whereof I am too much one) live, as if God were so obliged to them for their Faith, that he were bound to winke upon their workes, and not to be an Idolater, or not a Heretick, were enough not to be damned.

And certainlie to say, *That one tittle of Gods Word shall not passe away*, is not to say, that God will keepe here alwaies a knowne companie of men to teach us all Divine Truths, which from them, because of their authoritie, we may without more adoe accept (for unlesse you meane the Church in this sence, it concernes not our differences) till you can prove that this word makes some such promise. For this seemes to me onelie to shew the veracitie of Gods Word, without speaking at all of any Churches continuall obe-

dience to it, or true interpretation of it, or the impossibilitie of her receiving the Traditions of men for the will of God.

Besides in this Paragraph I obserye three things:

The first, That you now draw your Arguments from the stedfast Truth of Holie Writ, whereas you neither quote out of it any thing to prove your maine Assertion, and in that way, which you laid before to finde out Truth by, you tooke no notice at all of Scripture, but would have all differences decided, by onely comparing what men had by verball Tradition, like that *Dominican*, of whom *Erasmus* tels us in his Epistles, that when in the Schooles any man refuted his conclusion, by shewing it contrarie to the words of Scripture, he would crie out, *Ista est Argumentatio Lutherana, protestor me non responsurum*; This is a Lutheran way of Arguing, I protest I will not answer to it.

Secondlie, You now bring the proofe of your certaintie from Gods Spirit never failing his Church (though you neither define what is there meant by Church, nor doe you bring any proofe, or ever can, that Gods Spirit will stay with any unlesse they please it, or that this will not consist with the least error in divine matters) whereas before you made it a Physicall, or rather superphysicall certaintie, that Traditions must be delivered from Age to Age uncorrupted, and this, not because of any other assistance, but *ex necessitate Rei.*

Thirdlie,

Thirdlie, You seeme to thinke, that aptnesse to startle in the faithfull, will serve to secure them from all error, whereas I must professe my selfe, of opinion, that in some times, and some cases, that may serve to induce it; for (it being trulie said, that there is as much follie beyond wisedome, as on this side of it, and *Nazianzene* telling us trulie, that *δια μαρτάνουσιν τοῦ σκόπου οἱ τὸ ζεύοντες ἄντε εἴσω πέμπωσιν, ἄντε ὑπερπέμπωσιν*, the marke is equallie missed by over shooting, as by shooting short) I doubt whether over much caution may not have made some doctrines, and their Abetters condemned (especiallie when they appeared somewhat new) some Truths rejcted for feare, least they did by consequence contradict some point of Faith, when indeed they did, *ὥσπερ οἱ κύνες πρὶν σκέψασθαι εἰ φίλος, εἰ μονὸν ψοφήσῃ, ὑλάκτουσιν*, as Dogs often barke at a friend for an enemie, upon the first noise he makes, before having considered which he is: This made the Ancients so earnest against the now-certaintie of the *Antipodes*, this in after times, for the same opinion, cost a Bishop his Bishopricke, and truth in all probabilitie, would have then beene defined a heresie, if a generall Councell had been called about it: Since then this aptnesse to startle hath inclined Orthodox Christians to condemn, not onely those who had affirmed in termes the contrarie to Tradition, but even those, from whose opinions they thought it would result, and consequentlie to exact an Assent, not onely to direct Tradition, but also to whatsoever else seemed to them reasonable

Arist. Ethick.

deductions from it; This seemes to me a way by which Errors may have entered by shoales, the first Ages (I mean then, *Cum* Augustinus *habebatur inexpugnabilis Dialecticus, quòd legisset Categorias* Aristotelis) not having been so carefull and subtile in their Logick, as these more learned times both *Arminians* and *Calvinists*, *Dominicans* and *Jesuites*, *Papists* and *Protestants*, seeming to me to argue much more consequently to their owne Principles, more close to their present businesse, and every way more rationally then the ancient Doctors used to do I mean those which I have seen: And I am confident that if two or three Fathers should rise againe unknown, and should return to their old Argument against the *Arrians*, from *Cor meum eructavit verbum bonum*, both Parties would be so farr from receiving them for Judges, that neither would accept of them for Advocates, nor trust their Cause to their arguing, who opposed their common enemy no better.

Now that this way of making Deductions out of Tradition, and those both very hasty, and false ones is very ancient, appeares even by an example in the end of the Gospell of *John*, for there out of Christs words falsly interpreted, a conclusion was drawn and spread among the Bretheren, that Saint *John* should not dye, and what they did out of these words of Christ, other in other times may have done out of other words of his, and their Collection passe for his Doctrine; which shewes the great advantage which we have by Gods Word being written since, if it had not, we could

not

not alwaies have gone to a new examination of the very words, which Christ or his Apostles taught, and consequently a consequence of them spread in the place of them, would have been more incurable then now it is. I will also desire you to look in the five hundered eighty fourth Page of the *Florentine Councell*, set out by *Binius*, and there you will find, that the *Latines* confesse, that they added the Procession of the Holy Ghost, from the Son, to the Creed, because the contrary opinion seemed to them by consequence, contrary to a confessed Tradition of Christs eternall Divinity, to which, yet it will appear out of what Cardinall *Perron* hath excellently shown, (though upon another occasion) that it doth not contradict, but that this consequence was ill drawne, which may have been in other points too, and have brought in no small multitude of Errors since, neither was their *Logick* certaine to conclude better, nor were they lesse apt to add to their Creeds accordingly, at any other times then they were at that.

Con. Reg. Lac. pag. 708.

I doubt not but whosoever shall have received satisfaction in the discourse past, will also have received in the point we seek after, that is, in being assured both that Christ hath left a Directory in the World, and where to find him, there being no doubt but it is his holy Church upon Earth: Nor can there be any doubt which is his Church, since there is but one that doth, and can lay claime to have received from hand to hand his holy Doctrine.

Object.

That which makes you expect that your Reader should have received satisfaction by what you have

Resp.

said.

said, is, that since Christ hath a great care of his Elect, he must consequently (most strongly of any thing) have rooted his Church. Now I having shewed, that by your own confession, men may be of his Elect, that are out of your Church, I seemed to my selfe to have likewise proved, that there is no necessity of any Churches being their Director. I know you generally think this the more convenient way, to have left such a guide, that because otherwise *Dominus non fuisset Discretus*, or in *Epictus* his Phrase, θεὸς οὐκὰν ἐπιμελεῖτο ἡμῶν ὃν δεῖ τρόπον, you conclude that he hath: but we (though indeed in such cases where our κοινὰς ἐννοίας the common Notions concerning God, teach us that such a Thing were contrary to Gods maine Attributes to do, some of us conclude upon that ground, that this he hath not done) in these cases which onely concerne convenience, of which we have much lesse certaintie, begin at the other end, and considering first what he hath done, conclude that to be sufficiently convenient, and so finding no infallible guide by him instituted, suppose it convenient that there should be none: Truely if convenience were the measure, and our Understandings the measurers, we should resolve that God hath made every Particular man, at least every Pious man Infallible, and so to need no outward guide, which yet it is plain that he hath not done. Though in my opinion, in some sence, he hath made every man (who pleaseth) Infallible, in respect of his journys end, though not of all Innes by the way, certaine to find Heaven though he may

Arrian.

misse

misse many Truthes in Divine matters: For the beliefe which God requires of being to be thought true of his word, and that man be ready to believe and obey what he saies, as soon as it shall appear to him that he hath said it, and every man being able (according to his meanes) to examine what he hath said; It followes, unlesse God should damne a man for weaknesse of understanding, (which were as strange, as if he should damne him for a weak sight, or a feeble arme) that every man is Infallible in his way to Heaven, so he lay no blocks in it himself, (at least is undoubtedly secur'd of any danger of Hell) For if they neither desire to avoide the trouble of enquiry through unwillingnes to find that to be true, which is contrary to what he now thinks, and so to hazard either the affection of deare Friends, or the favour of great Friends, or the feare of some other humane Inconvenience, as want of present meanes, Improbability to get more, or of that disparagement so terrible to flesh and blood, of descending to confesse that they have so long erred, (like *Frobenius, qui potuisset vivere, nisi puduisset ægrotare,* who might have lived, but that he was ashamed to confesse himself sick) If I say none of these or the like things, either keep him from seeking what is Gods will, or from daring to professe it when he hath found it, then such an Error having no reference to the will, which is the onely fountaine of sin, cannot by a just God be punished as a sin, and the proofe of the necessity of an Infallible Director drawn from Gods care of his Church, for his

Eras. Ep.

his Elects ſake, is eaſily avoided.

But ſay you, if there be a director, it muſt be the Church, and againe, becauſe you know that all congregations of Chriſtians, pretend to that Title in ſome ſence, (as even the worſt men call themſelves by better Names then they deſerve, as *Ariſtotle* ſaith, οἱ λησαὶ ἑαυτὰς ποιητὰς καλοῦσιν) and I may miſtake our enemies Camp for our friends, and ſerve againſt Chriſt, whilſt I think I fight under his Banner (though even then, I beleeve, I ſhould have a ſhare in that prayer of his, to whom none is denied, *Father forgive them, for they know not what they doe*) unleſſe you gave me ſome certaine marks to know the Church by; you therefore ſay, what you have before ſaid, that yours is it, becauſe that alone pretends to Tradition, to which I anſwer, what I before anſwered, that the *Greeks* ſerve me to diſprove the ſufficiency of this Mark, who profeſſe, that they hold the conſtant Tradition, and that under that Notion, they have both received what you deny, and not received what you propoſe.

Rhetor.

Object. *Let us conſider in her Preſence or Viſibility, Authority, Power; As for the firſt, her multitude and ſucceſſion make the one, that ſhe is ever acceſſible, ever knowne.*

Reſp. What you now ſay, is not to prove your Church a Directreſſe, but having (as you think, and I think not) proved that already, you now mean to ſhew, that ſhe hath the Conditions requiſite in a Directreſſe: But this I deny, for neither is her preſence or Viſibility, (for all her mul-

multitude and ſucceſſion) ſuch as were in a Direct-reſſe required: For ſhe (beſides that ſhe muſt bring notice and proofes with her, to prove that ſhe is inſtituted by God to direct men, and thoſe plain and evident, if ſhe require meerly but our aſſent, but if ſhe require us to aſſent Infallibly, then thoſe Infallible, which yours cannot do) muſt alſo be ſo viſible, as to be known to all men, if not as a Directreſſe, at leaſt as a Company of men, which yours ſure was not to thoſe Nations, which were lately diſcovered by *Columbus*: But if you except and ſay, ſhe need onely be viſible to all Chriſtians, (though this exception need a proofe) yet even this Condition your Church hath not allwaies had, for I believe, to thoſe Chriſtians whom *Xaverius* found in the *Eaſt-Indies*, your Church had been as little viſible, as to thoſe *Pagans* whom *Columbus* diſcovered in the *Weſt*: Beſides beyond the *Abiſſins*, how farre Chriſtian Religion may be propagated, and yet your Church unknown, who can tell? Beſides, even to moſt of them (for any credible Teſtimony that appeares) ſhe may not be very viſible. But above all, that reaſon being anſwered, upon which you conclude, that there is ſome Director, and that ground being taken away upon which you build, that yours is that, me thinks it will be unneceſſary to diſpute long upon the Conditions required to that, which hath no entity at all.

Object.

For Authority, her very claime of Antiquity and Succeſſion, to have been that Church which received her beginning from Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and never

being all united under the universall government of ver fore-went it giveth a great reverence to her among those who believe her, and amongst those who with indifferency seek to inform themselves, a great Prejudice above others. And if it be true, it carrieth an infinite Authority with it, of Bishops, Doctors, Martyrs, Saints, Miracles, Learning, Wisedome, Venerable Antiquity, and such like.

Resp. There is no Question, but any Church, true or false, which claimes to have ever kept the Apostles Doctrines uncorrupted, and is infallibly believed to have done so, must among those Christians who thus beleeve, have even equall Authority with the Apostles. But me thinks that this claime before proofe, should to others be any prejudice for her, (especially to those who have great Arguments against her) is unreasonable, and if after consideration it appears otherwise, she hath then onely helpt to weaken her Testimony, and hath destroyed her Infallible Authority in any thing else.

Object. *There remaineth Power, which no man can doubt but he hath given it most ample, who considereth his words so often repeated to his Apostles: But abstracting from that, who doth not see that the Church hath the nature and proportion of ones Country to everyone. As in a mans Country he hath Father and Mother, Brothers, Sisters, Kinsfolkes, and Allies, Neighbours and Country-men, (anciently called* Cives *and* Concives*) and of these are made his Country; So in the Church finds he in way to spirituall Instruction, and Education, all these digrees nearer and further off, till he come unto that furthermost of*

Christ

Chriſt his Vicar: and as he in his Country finds Bearing, Breeding, Settling in Eſtates and Fortunes, and laſtly, Protection and Security; So likewiſe in the way of Chriſtianity, doth he find this much more fully in the Church, So that if it be true, that a man oweth more to his Maſter then to his Father, Bene eſſe *is better then* eſſe; *certainly a man alſo (as farr as Church and Country can be ſeparated) muſt owe more to the Church, then to his very Country; Wherefore the Power which the Church hath to Command and inſtruct, is greater then the Power of the Temporall Community, of which he is part.*

I wiſh you would have ſet down theſe words of Chriſt, ſo often repeated to his Apoſtles, in which Power to the Church (I mean ſuch a one as yours pretends) is undoubtedly given; For my Part, Truely I remember none; For I ſuppoſe not that the Power given to the Apoſtles can reaſonably be claimed by any Society of men now, no not though you ſhould extend the Definition as largely as *Eraſmus*, (who ſaies *Eccleſiam voco totius Populi Chriſtiani concenſum*, I call the Church, the Conſent of the whole Chriſtian People) unleſſe that be meant too in all Ages, and ſo the Apoſtles would come in; They were ſo ſigned, and ſealed to (as I may ſay) from Heaven, by having moſt converſed with Chriſt, and been moſt beloved by him, and choſen eſpecially to teach the World his Will, that it is impoſſible any men could be indeed Chriſtians, and not receive their Doctrine, as that of Chriſt, without any other Proofe, but there is no other Church that hath *Reſp.*

ſuch a Privilędge, The Power of propoſing ſhe hath, and ſo have you, and without Queſtion, if you can convince any Chriſtian that what you ſaid, Chriſt ſaid firſt, he is bound both to believe and obey it, and againe let all Churches joyne in propoſall, yet till he be ſo convinced, (unleſſe his own fault hinder it) it binds him not, neither is it ſufficiently propoſed, allowing it true, which it is not alwaies neceſſary that it ſhould be, although ſo atteſted. For as a Naturall Foole is not bound to obey any Doctrine or Precept, taught or impoſed by God himſelf, becauſe his underſtanding cannot diſcover it to be ſo: ſo in my opinion, whoſe underſtanding ſoever is not convinc'd of the ſame, (how plain ſoever to others the thing be) he is for as much as concernes this point, in the ſtate of a Naturall Foole, and no more to be condemned.

Neither ſee I what you prove out of the Proportion between the Church, and every mans Country, (for if any Church be intended by God to be ſo our Director, that her propoſitions are to be received, becauſe they are hers, then indeed we owe her much more obedience then to our Country, which if it ſhould require of us to believe an opinion true, becauſe that hath defined it, I believe no man would obey, and he who ſhould preſs us to it, would be accounted ſo mad, that we ſhould ſend him, not to a Doctor of Divinity, but to a Doctor of Phyſick, to be confuted.

And that any Church is ſo intended, appeares not at all by this propoſition, ſince the ſame is even amongſt the Church of the *Turkes*, which is *Eccleſia malignantium*,

malignantium, for there they find their Metaphoric ll Fathers, Mothers, Brothers, Sisters, Kinsfolks, Allies, Neighbours, (which all Hereticks do too among themselves) all these degrees neerer and further of, till at last they come to that furthermost, of being united under the Universall Government of *Mahomets* Vicar, the *Mufty*. But to them you would say, that this proves not Truth, but at most Concord, and that is *Factio inter Malos*, which is *Amicitia inter Bonos*, therefore the same we answer you, since Pyrats, and Theeves, have as strict bonds among themselves, as the honestest persons, and often gerater conspiracies, and συγχρτίσους, to destroy these, then they make to defend themselves. And whereas you say, that we owe more gratitude and obedience to the Church, then to our Country, I have told you, that this may be true without owing obedience to all she teaches; But yet even this in some sence is True; To the generall Tradition of Christians of the first Ages who lived with the Apostles, and could not in any likelyhood but know their writings; I owe the knowledge of the Scripture, and to that, the knowledge of Gods will, and to that, Heaven, if I conforme carefully to it both my Life and my Beliefe; and to the Church in this sence, I owe both as much gratitude as you please, and believe whatsoever this, as generally, witnesseth to have received from the Apostles: But this concerning any present Church, doth as little concerne your present purpose: For let us mean by the Church, that company.

Salust.

pany of men which hath kept Tradition wholly uncorrupted, (and ſuppoſe there is ſuch a one) yet to know that ſhe hath done ſo, I muſt examine her Doctrine; and compare it either with Scripture, or the firſt Antiquity, and ſo rather receive her for it, then it for her: Beſides, that the whole Church teaches nothing, and if ſhe did, yet by the ſame waies from any ſingle learned Orthodox man, I may receive the ſame inſtruction, to whoſe commands nevertheleſſe (except when he delivers Gods) I owe no obedience.

Thus too, when the Orthodox company commands as they are Orthodox, that is ſomething of the will of God, then they are to be obeyed, and ſo am I, and ſo againe, when the choſen governours for that purpoſe, command indifferent Things, but if they exceed their Commiſſion in commanding, no man is longer bound to obey, no more then if a *Mayor* of a Town ſhould command the People to make his Hay, they were bound to obedience, ſince commanding more then his Magiſtracy authorizeth him, he in that caſe is no Magiſtrate.

Object. *This Church can ſatisfie both learned and unlearned. For in matters of Faith, above the reach of learning, whoſe ſpring is from what Chriſt and his Apoſtles taught, what learned man can refuſe in his inmoſt ſoule, to bow to that which is teſtified by ſo great a multitude to have come from Chriſt? and what unlearned man can require more for his faith, then to be taught by a Miſtreſſe of ſo many prerogaives and advantages above all others.*

The

The learned cannot reaſonablie be ſatisfied with this (eſpeciallie ſo farre forth as to beleeve it infalliblie true.) Firſt, becauſe they ſee great multitudes have and doe teſtifie contrarie things. Secondlie, becauſe they muſt have obſerved with *Salmeron*, that a multitude of ſome opinion may proceed from ſome one Doctor, eſpeciallie, if he be Illuſtrious; and ſome againe, taken with a pious and an humble feare, chuſe rather againſt their mind, to approve what hath come from others, then to bring forth any new thing out of their own underſtanding, leaſt they may ſeem to bring ſome thing unwonted into the Church. This they muſt needs ſee, may bring an undelivered opinion to be generall, and then the generallitie may bring it to be thought to come from Tradition, according to *Tertullians* rule, *Quod apud multas eccleſias unum invenitur, non eſt erratum ſed Traditum*, and that of Saint *Auſtine*, that of whatſoever no beginning is known, and yet is generall, is to be beleeved to have its originall from the Apoſtles. By this way (ſuppoſing that all your Church did witneſſe, all their doctrines to have had ſuch a lineall ſucceſſion, which they know to be falſe) they ſee, that opinions falſlie and illogicallie deduct from true Traditions, may be equallie beleeved to be ſuch themſelves, *Vincentius Lirinenſis* allowing the following Church to give light to the former, which they might miſtake in doing, at leaſt, the certaintie of her Illuſtrations cannot have their force from Tradition: By this way they ſee, that in time, ſuch doctrines may come

Reſp.

Tom. 12. Pag 468.

come to have ſuch a generall atteſtation, which had their firſt ſpring from Scripture miſ-interpreted, either by publicke miſtakes, or by Councels miſlead, either by feare, error, or partialitie, and what proceeded either from conſent, or definition, may ſeem to have been deduct from Tradition: In this they will be confirmed, by ſeeing plainlie, that more is now required to be beleeved by the Church of *Rome*, then in all times hath been, that now among you contrarie parties urge for or, expect a generall Councell to end queſtions, concerning which, neither ſide claimes any continued verball Tradition, and that the greateſt part are ready to receive ſuch a definition, in as high a degree, as any Tradition whatſoever; They will be alſo confirmed by your denying Infallibilitie to a Councell, how generall ſoever, unapproved by the Pope, by ſeeing, that if (as you ſay) no man can be ignorant what he was taught when he was a childe, as the ground and ſubſtance of his hopes for all eternitie, and if in this, all your Religion were compriſed (or elſe to what purpoſe ſay you this) then no man bred in the Orthodox Church could erre, or ever have erred in matter of Faith, without knowing that he had departed from the very Baſis of Chriſtianitie, and for Inſtructions in theſe points, not onely all Authors, as Commenters upon Scripture, and the like, were wholly uſeleſſe, but it were alſo a vaine thing, to goe for inſtruction even to Chriſts Vicar, and S. *Hierome* might have reſolved his own queſtion, about the ἀνούσιος, every whit as well as

Damaſus,

Damaſus, or Saint *Peter* himſelfe: And for the ſame reaſon, it were wholly impoſſible, that at the ſame time the Popes, and moſt notable, and moſt pious, and moſt learned Papiſts living, ſhould have juſtified, and applauded *Eraſmus* for the ſame workes (the one by his printed *Diplomas*, and the reſt by their Letters) for which, at the ſame inſtant, the greateſt part of the Monkes counted and proclaimed him a more peſtilent Heretick then *Luther*, if they had all weighed hereſie in the ſame ballance, and more impoſſible if in yours; which the learned will yet leſſe approve of, when they ſee how ſoon the worſe opinion, and leſſer authoritie may prevaile, as how that of the Monkes hath done againſt that of the Popes, and Biſhops, and that ſo much, that *Eraſmus* is now generallie diſavowed as no Catholicke, and given to us (whom wee accept as a great preſent) that *Bellarmine* will allow him to be but halfe a Chriſtian, and Cardinall *Perron* (which I am ſorry for) gives a cenſure upon him, which would better have become the pen of a *Latomus*, a *Bedda*, a *Stunica*, or an *Egmundane*, then of ſo learned and judicious a Prelate.

Now for the Ignorant, I am ſure you will never be able to prove infalliblie to them, that your Church hath any prerogatives above others; the ordinarie way cannot be taken with them, becauſe they not underſtanding the languages, in which the Fathers and Councels are written, cannot be preſs'd by what they cannot conſtrue, and your way as little, becauſe they are not more

(though totallie) ignorant of the Authors of paſt Ages, then they are of the ſtate, opinions, and claimes of the preſent time; ſo that I know not how you can attempt them, if they have but a moderate underſtanding to their no knowledge.

Object. *The body of our Poſition ſhoots forth the branches of divers Queſtions, or rather the Solutions of them: And firſt, how it happened, that divers Heretickes pretended to Tradition, as the* Chiliaſts, Gnoſticks, Carpocratians, *and divers others, yet they with their Traditions have been rejected, and the Church onely left in claime of Tradition; For if we looke into what Catholicke Tradition is; and what the Hereticks pretended, the queſtion will remaine voided. For the Catholicke Church cals Tradition, that Doctrine, which was publiquely delivered, and the Heretucks called Tradition, a kinde of ſecret Doctrine, either gathered out of private converſation with the Apoſtles, or rather pretended, that the Apoſtles, beſides what they publiquely taught the world, had another myſticall way, proper to Schollers, more endeared, which came not to publique view, whereas the force and energie of a Tradition, reſiding in the mulitude of hearers, and being planted in the perpetuall life and actions of Chriſtians, it muſt have ſuch a publicity, that it cannot be unknown amongſt them.*

Reſp. Of the *Carpocratians* and *Gnoſticks*, I have ſpoke before, but ſure for the *Chiliaſts* this is onely ſaid and not proved: Howſoever this undeniablie appeares, that either *Pappias* and *Irenæus* thought not

not this Tradition to have come ſuch a way as you ſpeake of, or elſe they thought it no hereticall way, but ſuch a one, as was (at leaſt reaſonablie) to be aſſented to; and both what was the way by which Traditions ought to come, and by which this came they were more likely to know, then thoſe of following ages; which proves, that this Objection (as much as concernes them eſpeciallie) remaines ſtill ſo ſtrong, that (in ſpite of *Fevardentius*) it will be better to anſwer it, *Scalpello quam Calamo*, with a Pen-knife then with a Pen, and no Confuter will ſerve for it, but an *Expurgatory Index*, no *non ſi tuus afforet Hector*, if Cardinall *Perron* were alive.

I muſt by the way take notice of what yon ſay here, that Tradition muſt have ſuch a Publicity as cannot be unknown among Chriſtians, and deſire you to agree this with what you ſay in the next *Paragraph*, that the Apoſtles may not have preached in ſome Countries ſome Doctrines, which we now are bound to receive as Traditions, for ſure thoſe Doctrines were then unknown among many Chriſtians; and if they had been neceſſary, ſure the Apoſtles would no where have forgot (with ſo good a Prompter as the Holy Ghoſt) to have taught them; If they were not then neceſſary, how have they grown to be ſo ſince? Beſides, I appeal to your Conſcience, whether it appear that the doctrine of the Exchequer of Superabundant merits, of which the Pope is Lord Treaſurer, and by vertue of which he diſpenſeth his pardons to all the Soules in Purgatory, appear to have been known even to

any of the beſt Chriſtians, and whether if it had been known to them as a Tradition, (being a Doctrine which neceſſitates at leaſt Wiſdome and Charity, a continuall practice of ſueing for them, and of giving them) it were poſſible, that of what they knew, ſuch infinite Volumes of Authors ſhould make no mention.

Object. *Suppoſe ſome private Doctrine of an Apoſtle to ſome Diſciple ſhould be publiſhed, and recorded by that Diſciple, and ſome others, this might well be a Truth, but never obtain the force of a Catholique Poſition, that is, ſuch as it would be a damnation to reject, becauſe the deſcent from the Apoſtle is not notorious, and fit to ſway the body of the whole Church.*

Reſp. I confeſſe, that to have been no more generally delivered, will prove that the Apoſtles thought not ſuch a Doctrine neceſſary, elſe their Charity would not have ſuffered them to have ſo much concealed it, but yet to any ſuch Doctrine, it is impoſſible that any Chriſtian, who believes the teſtimony, that it came from the Apoſtles, ſhould deny his aſſent, becauſe it were to deny the Authority, upon which all the reſt is grounded; for the Church pretends to her Authority from them, and not they from her, and howſoever, ſuch a Doctrine (although not neceſſary) could not be damnable as you make this: Beſides here will firſt ariſe a Queſtion not eaſie to be decided, how great a multitude of Witneſſes will ſerve to be notorious, and fit to ſway the body of the Church, eſpecially ſo many having not for a long while been thought fit even by Catholiques, though atteſting doctrines

ſince

ſince received by you all, and conſidering that multitude of your Church, which believe the immaculate Conception in as high a degree, as it is poſſible without excommunicating the deniers, who either walk not by that which you count the onely Catholique Rule, or elſe claime ſuch a Tradition, who yet are not thought fit to ſway the reſt.

Secondly, I pray obſerve how eaſie it was for the two firſt Ages, at leaſt the chiefe of them, and all that are extant, to have given aſſent to Traditions ſo unſufficiently teſtified, or to have miſtaken Doctrines under that notion, (for ſo they did to this of the *Chiliaſts*) and then after for it to ſpread till it were generall, and laſt as long as men laſt upon their authority, and when once it is ſo ſpread, how ſhall we then diſcover how ſmall an Originall it had, when peradventure the head and ſpring of it will be as hard to find, as that of *Nilus*, ſo that the greateſt part of what you receive, might poſſibly appear to be no certainer, nor better built, if we could digg to the foundation: Wherefore, ſince the delivery of a Tradition by ſubſequent Ages hath its validity onely from the authority of the firſt, me thinks you ſhould either think that they received none but upon better grounds, or elſe think theſe grounds good.

Thirdly, I know not why you reſolve this opinion of the *Chiliaſts*, to have had onely ſuch a private Tradition, for though they name *John* the Diſciple, and mention certaine Prieſts who heard it from him, yet they deny not a more generall delivery of

of it, but peradventure leaſt men might think that the generall opinion (that it came from the Apoſtles) might ariſe from places of Scripture, (which fallacie, their teſtimony when not ſo fully expreſſed, was ſtill in danger of concerning any point, but that theſe books were written by theſe men) they therefore thought it fit to name to us their witneſſes, that it came from Chriſts owne mouth, and in what words: And if they had done ſo much on your ſide, for the differences between us, I believe you would now have few Proteſtant adverſaries left, for you would have converted the greater part, and by that have been enabled to burn the ſmaller.

Object. *The ſecond Queſtion may be, How it cometh to paſſe, that ſome things, which at firſt bindes not the Churches beliefe, afterwards commeth to bind it? For if it were ever a Tradition, it ever muſt needs be publique, and ever bind the Church, and if once it were not, it appears not how ever it could come to be, for if this age for example have it not, how can it deliver it to the next that followeth? But if we conſider that the ſcope of Chriſtian Doctrine being great, and the Apoſtles preaching in ſo great varieties of Countries, it might happen ſome point in one Country might be leſſe underſtood, or peradventure not preacht, which in another was often preacht, and well both underſtood and retained, we may eaſily free our ſelves from theſe brambles: For the Spirit of Tradition reſiding in this, that the teſtimony be* exceptione majus, *and beyond all danger of deceit. It is not neceſſary to the efficaciouſneſſe of Tradition, that*

the

the whole vniverſall Church ſhould be witneſſe to ſuch a truth, but ſo great a part as could be a warrant againſt miſtaking; ſo that if all the Churches of Aſia, Greece, *or* Affrick, *or* Ægypt, *ſhould conſtantly affirm ſuch a Tradition to have been delivered them from the Apoſtles, it were enough to make a Doctrine* exceptione maiorem: *Whence it enſueth, that if in a meeting of the vniverſall Church it were found, that ſuch a part hath ſuch a Tradition concerning ſome matter, whereof the reſt had either no underſtanding, or no certainty, ſuch a Doctrine would paſſe into a neceſſary bond of Faith in the whole Church.*

Your ſword is ſo ſharp, and your ſhield ſo weak, that I can hardly believe they came out of the ſame forge, but when I obſerve how much you have a better right hand then a left, and that not onely you have raiſed an objection which you cannot lay, but your anſwer to it multiplies more, I cannot compare you to him in *Lucian*, who travelling with a Magician that had no ſervant, and inſtead of one was daily wont to ſay to a Peſtle, Peſtle be thou a man, and it would be ſo, and when his occaſions were ſerved, would bid it return to be a Peſtle, and was obeyed, thought one time to imitate the Magitian, he being abroad, and made indeed the Peſtle a man, and draw water, but could not make it return to the former ſtate, but it continued ſtill to draw, wherefore angry and afraid, he took up an axe and clove the Peſtle-man in two, whereupon ἐκάτερον τὸ μέρος ὑδροφορεῖ, in ſtead of one water-drawer there lept up two: For firſt I pray conſider,

Reſp.

Philoſ.

conſider, what could you have found more certaine to deſtroy all, which you had before laboured to ſettle, about the Infallibilitie of your Tradition, then this diſtincton of *Exceptione Majoris*, ſince, if not a generall one, but one which ſeemed ſuch, were required, how eaſie was it for falſe opinions to get in, under that colour, teſtified but by a few reputed honeſt men, and ſo received by, and tranſmitted from others of great and generall authoritie. Secondlie, how could you have found a better way to anſwer your owne Objection againſt the *Chiliaſts* Tradition, for want of being ſufficientlie publique, ſince if that had not ſeemed to them to have had this condition (I mean, if they had thought they ſhould for this cauſe have excepted againſt it) it had been impoſſible theſe Saints ſhould have received it, and concerning the publicitie of it, and the number and authoritie of the deliverers, they muſt of neceſſitie have been the beſt Judges who then lived, and who were the more conſiderable Doctors of the moſt conſiderable Ages: ſo that you muſt either confeſſe, that a Tradition bindes not unleſſe indeed generall, or confeſſe that this doth, ſuppoſing this not to have been generall, which you cannot prove.

Object. *A likely example of this may be drawn from the Canonicall Bookes.*

Reſp. I deny it to be now neceſſarie to Salvation, to admit of any Bookes for Canonicall, which it was lawfull for Chriſtians in paſt ages to doubt of, and which had no generall Tradition; and againe, this

anſwer

anſwer helpes againſt your ſelfe: for it is plaine by Saint *Hieromes* Teſtimonie, that the *Roman* Church received not the Epiſtle to the *Hebrewes*, which the *Eaſterne* Churches received (whoſe Teſtimonie, according to your grounds, ſhe then ſhould have beleeved to be beyond exception) and it is plaine by *Perrons* Teſtimonie, that the *Eaſterne* Churches received not the *Macchabees*, when he ſaies, the Church of *Rome* did. Now it is plaine, that the Receivers pretended to Tradition, becauſe nothing elſe could make a booke thought Canonicall, whereas other opinions might be brought in by a falſe Interpretation of Scriptures, and after being ſpread, might be thought to come from Tradition: So that according to your grounds and theſe teſtimonies, not onely the *Weſterne* Church ought to have beleeved the *Eaſterne* about the Epiſtle to the *Hebrewes*, and the *Eaſterne* the *Weſterne* about the *Macchabees*, but alſo they ought to have required this aſſent from each other, which they not doing (as they would have done, if they had thought their teſtimonie ſo valid as you doe) it followes, that you doe differ from the Churches of the fifth and ſixth age, about what is *exceptione majus*, you thinking that to be ſo, which they thought not, and againe, from all the extant Doctors of the two firſt ages, you thinking that not ſo, which they thought was, as alſo thoſe two times agreed about it, as little with each other, as you with them both.

The third queſtion may be, how Chriſtian Religion (conſiſting of ſo many points) is poſsible to Object.

be kept uncorrupted by Tradition, which depending upon Memory, and our memory being so fraile, it seemeth, cannot without manifest miracle conserve so great a diversity of points unchanged for so many ages. But if we consider, that Faith is a Science, a thing, whose parts are so connexed, that if one be false, all must needs be false, we shall easily see, that contrarily, the multitude of divers points is a conservation, the one to the right, the other wherein we doubt.

Resp. As in *Judges*, when a battell was to be fought betwixt the children of *Israel* and the *Midianites*, the *Midianites* destroyed each other, and left nothing to doe for *Israel*, but onely to pursue them: so truly, your Objections worke so strongly upon your own Party, that I have nothing left me to presse, and much to applaud: For for this very reason, I beleeve, that all necessarie points were given in writing, and onely the witnessing, that these were the Apostles writings, was left to Tradition, which was both much lesse subject to error (as being but one point, and that a matter of fact) and could no other way be done, because no writing could have witnessed for it selfe so sufficientlie, that we should have had reason to have beleeved it upon no other certificates, and to this your answer seemes to me no way satisfactorie, since, first, I deny Faith to be a Science, it being nothing but an assent to Gods Revelations, neither are those so connexed as you liberallie affirme, and sparinglie proven. Nay, suppose they were, yet though errors would be the lesse likely to enter, yet

yet when any one, by any meanes were got in' then this connexion would be a ready way to helpe it to let in all its fellowes. Beſides, thoſe opinions which may be ſuperinduct as Traditions, which ſuch a connexion could not hinder, if they were not contrarie to the true ones; and of this ſort is chiefly our queſtion.

That therefore you are no better able to wind your ſelfe out of this inextricable Labyrinth, is no wonder to me, and no diſgrace to you, ſince a man may as well be a good Logician, though he cannot ſolve an unſolvable queſtion, as he may be exceedinglie skilled in Phyſick, and yet not able to cure an incurable diſeaſe; Beſides, that theſe Objections aroſe ſo at the firſt ſight, out of what was to be conſidered, that it was as impoſſible for to avoid them, as to anſwer them.

Let us conſider in conſtant Nations, their language, their habits, &c. how long they continue among them. Object.

Truly there is no Nation that I know, whoſe language hath not, and doth not daily palpablie ſuffer change. Conſider, that of theſe *Engliſh* hourely denizoning words of all kinde of languages, theſe of the *Spaniards*, *Italians*, and *French*, almoſt made up out of Latine, and that of the ancient *Greekes*, unknown to thoſe of this Age, unleſſe they learn it at Schoole: Habits indeed ſome Nations alter leſſe, but ſome daily, and none change not ſometimes: But this is little to the purpoſe, ſince thoſe Nations which have remained very conſtant in things, which no conſiderable *Reſp.*

cauſe appeared to them why they ſhould alter, may yet have received new opinions (eſpecially if not contradicting the old) taught them by ſuch, in whom they wholly relied, (as moſt go more hood-winkt in theſe matters, then in thoſe which are indifferent, out of a Vitious humility) or proved by Arguments which perſwaded. For when the reaſons are probable (as they may be for a falſhood) the Perſons preſſing them, in themſelves of authority (as they may be and yet erre) and the people to whom they are preſt, full of eſteeme of their Teachers, then meet the three waies of working perſwaſion which *Ariſtotle* mentions, whereof αἱ μὲν ἐν τῷ ἤθει τῷ λέγοντος, αἱ δ' ἐν τῷ τὸν ἀκροατὴν διαθῆναι πῶς, αἱ μὲν ἐν τῷ δεικνύναι, ἢ φαίνεσθαι δεικνύναι: Eſpecially when beſides all theſe, the rewards of beliefe propoſed, are more then extraordinary, as alſo the danger of disbeliefe. Wherefore I count it by no meanes reaſonable, ἀκολουθεῖν τοῖς ἧττον πεφυλευκόσιν ἴχνεσι καθάπερ τὰ πρόβατα, like ſheep (without more examination) to walk in the ſteps of thoſe, who have gone before us.

Object. *See that forlorn Nation of the* Jews, *how conſtantly it maintaineth the Scripture, and how obſtinately their Errors.*

Reſp. Truely I thank you Sir for this example, ſince it puts me in mind of an Objection, which elſe I had utterly forgot: Many of thoſe errors which they hold, (as the *Cabala* and others) I pray, upon what other ground hold they them then this, that they have been taught. *Moſes* delivered them to their Fathers, as unwritten Traditions, and that under

der that Notion they have descended : Now may not they defend themselves in them, by the very same Arguments which you use in this Treatise for the Church of *Rome* : May not they say that they have received them from their Fathers, who received them from theirs, who must either have joyned in mistaking their Ancestors, or in intending to deceive their Posterity, whereof neither is credible : May not they say, what is said of these last Ages, may be said upwards and upwards, till they come to that, wherein their Fathers received these Doctrines from *Moses*, who was ἀξιόπιστος, as worthy of credit in the delivery of these, as in that of the ten Commandements, and their Fathers witnesses beyond exception, that these Doctrines be delivered : May they not ask you in what year or age, these errors entered among them, and say it is evidently true, that then their whole Church conspired to tell a lie. May they not bid you besides consider the Notoriousnesse of the lie ? such as he is very rarely found, who is so wicked as to venture upon, besides the greatness of the subject, and the damage ensuing to himself and his dearest Pledges : May they not adde, that the multitude of their Church is so dispersed through so many Countries and Languages, that it is impossible they should agree together upon a false determination, to affirm a falshood for a truth, no Interest being able to be common to them all to produce such an effect : This they may say, and if they do, and retort your own words upon your self, I know not truely what new ones you will find to answer

anſwer them in, unleſſe you change the whole courſe you now ſteere, and come about the ſame way which I now uſe to you, that is, ſhewing by what waies ſuch an opinion may have ſpread among them, although not at firſt received, and proving out of their owne Authors, that this hath not been alwaies held a Tradition among them, though now ſo accounted, which is ſometimes (as I remember) your owne *Galatinus* his way, and the beſt that is: But if to that they ſhould againe reply out of your own words (the Names onely changed) that if what *Moſes* delivered were certainely true, and what he delivered be to be ſeen in what they beleeved who heard him, and ſo till now, it is evident, that they who ſeek for truth in learned diſcourſes, muſt needs forego the moſt certaine and eaſie way of attaining what they aime at: That *Few*, who ſhould retort this, and much more of this kind upon you, and keep you to Tradition, and make their preſent Tradition (upon your grounds) the Judge of that, I am of opinion, would make you as ſilent, as if (according to the Proverb) you had ſeen a Wolf firſt, or were a *Pithagoricall-Freſhman*, and you would wiſh you had never put into an enemies hand ſuch a weapon againſt your ſelf, as this preſent diſcourſe: So that in *Anna Comnenas* Phraſe ἑκατέρωθεν σοβεῖν ὄρυγα, you have digged a ditch on either ſide of your ſelfe: For either you muſt grant theſe Arguments not to be ſufficient for your Party, or you muſt allow them to be ſufficient for a *Few*.

Object. *Whereſoever Chriſtians labour to convert Idolaters,*

laters, they find the onely Argument for their errors that they received them from their forefathers : The King of Socotora *thinking to please the* Portugalls *by reducing a Nation that had the Names of Christians to true Christianity, he found them obstinately protest to him, that they would sooner loose their lives, then part with the Religion their Ancestors had left them.*

This is no newes to me who lived seven yeares in *Ireland*, where, this is all the reason the Vulgar either have or give for their Religion, and it is the lesse strange, when I remember *Aristotle's Ethicks*, where he tells us of one, who defended the beating of his Father, thus, καὶ γὰρ οὗτος (ἔφη) τὸν ἑαυτοῦ κακεῖνος τὸν ἄκοθεν, because it had been the lineall custome of his Familie to do so. Yet for all this, that those who earnestly desire to keep the Religion of their Forefathers, and think they have done it, may yet be deceived, may appear to a Christian by the example of the *Jews*, and to any *Romanist*, by the example of the *Grecians*. *Resp.*

To your example of the answer to the King of *Socotora*, I answer,

That either those heterodox Christians had been at first converted by Hereticks, or by Catholiques; If by Catholiques, (and your Church be that, and your grounds be hers) then it is plaine, that men may grow into great error, who hold fast, as they think upon Tradition, and may swerve from that Rule, whilst they think they walk by it : If by Hereticks, then it seemes Catholiques (as you call them) are not the onely Religion that have converted

converted Nations, and that note of the Church which is so daily and so eagerly prest, appeares common to more then it: And so you may take which horne of my Dilemma you please.

Object. *To come at length to give an answer to him that demands a guide at my hands, I remit him to the moderne Visibe Church of* Rome, *that is, her who is in an externe sensible communion with the externe sensible Clergie of* Rome, *and the externe sensible Head, and Pastor of that Church. If he ask me, how he shall know her, I must counter-interrogate him, who he is. Is he an ignorant man? is he unlearned, yet of good understanding in the World? Is he a Scholer, and what Scholer? A Grammarian, whose understanding hath no other help then that of Languages? Is he a Philosopher? Is he a Divine? (I mean an Academicall one, for a true Divine is to teach not to ask this Question) Is he a Statesman? For he that can think one answer can, or ought to be made to all these, may likewise expect, that one cause may produce all effects: Yet I deny not but all must have the same guide, though they are to be assured of that guide in divers manners.*

Resp. I confesse Sir, you come to the Demander but at length, for till I had read further, I had not known that your Treatise was intended for an answer to mine, if I had not been told so when it was given me. For hitherto, as *Baash* a King of *Israel*, in the *Chronicles*, when he came against *Judah*, assail'd not their Cities, but built *Ramoth* against them, so you have not attempted to destroy what I had said, but raised another consideration, a City

City, a *Ramoth* of your own; againſt which I have brought ſuch battery, as ſeemes to me ſufficient to demolliſh it.

Now for your directions to a guide, I anſwer, ſuppoſing that there is one, and that this you ſpeak of be now it, (for you will not ſay ſhe alwaies is) and not to quarrell with you for giving me an accidentall and mutable guide, that being a thing which you ſuppoſe ſo neceſſary to be alwaies known, I will joyn iſſue upon this with you, whether ſhe be to be known to be a guide by any Infallible Notes, for ſuch are required by reaſon to beget ſuch an aſſent, as is required by you, all other being tearmed by your ſelves, not Faith, but Opinion. To your Contra-interrogation therefore who I am, that is, in whoſe Name I ſpeak, I anſwer and profeſſe my ſelf one of the notably ignorant, but though I act my own part onely, when I ſpeak in his perſon, yet for once I will adventure to anſwer you, in the name of the ſeverall perſons you ſpeak of, and will ſhew, that none of them have ſufficient cauſe to receive the guide which you propoſe upon the reaſons which you alleadge.

If the ignorant man ſpeaketh, I will ſhew him in the Church of God decencie, and Majeſtie of ceremonies, above all other Sects and Religions, whereby dull capacities are ſweetly enſnared to beleeve the truth they heare, from thoſe whom they ſee to have the outward ſignes of Vertue and Devotion. Object.

To this I anſwer, in the ignorant mans perſon (that is in my own) thus, I for my part, neither ſee what you ſay you ſhew me, (for in all decency and Reſp.

Majeſtie of ceremonies, the Kings Chappell ſeems to me to equall the Queens, and our Cathedrall Chur. hes, much to ſurpaſſe your cock-lofts) and if I did, yet the decency of them would not prove your Church to be a good guide, ſo well as a good miſtreſſe of ceremonies, and if by their majeſtie you mean their Magnificence, then that would onely prove her rich and not orthodox, ſince this is ſuch a note, that (her doctrine remaining as true as it is) one perſecution would ſerve to deſtroy it, and with it, all that meanes which you allow the Ignorant to find his guide by; And whereas you ſay, that dull capacities are by this ſweetly enſnared to beleeve the Truth; I anſwer, that by the ſame meanes they may be as ſweetly, and as eaſily enſnared to beleeve falſhoods, unleſſe you could ſhew that Majeſtie and Truth are inſeparable Companions.

Object. *If the unlearned ask, I ſhew him the claime of Antiquity, the multitude, the advantages of Sanctity, and Learning, how the World was once of this accord, and thoſe who oppoſed, when they firſt parted, firſt began the contrary Sects, how the points of difference be ſuch, as on the Catholique ſide help devotion, and on the contrary ſide diminiſh the ſame, and ſuch like ſenſible differences, which will clearly ſhew an advantage on the Catholiques ſide, which is the proportionall motive to his underſtanding.*

Reſp. I ſee indeed you claime Antiquitie, but do you think it reaſonable that I ſhould take your word. Our Divines (whom becauſe I know more, I have more cauſe to truſt then you, in a caſe of which I my

my ſelf can take no cognizance) abſolutely deny it, and to me you cannot diſprove them, unleſſe I had at leaſt ſome learning to enable me to judge, who quotes that trulie which now I cannot conſtrue: For multitude, I find not what that proves, it may work upon my feare rather then upon my aſſent, yet I am told, that many more Chriſtians diſagree from your Church in this maine Queſtion of her being a guide, then ſhe conſiſts of; that the *Turks* are more then both, and the *Pagans* more then all three, ſo that if they relate the ſtate of the world aright, multitude muſt rather ſeem an argument againſt truth then for it: And forasmuch as I can ſee my ſelf, your Religion is the leaſt in this Kingdome, and I know no other: For the advantages of ſanctitie and learning, to the firſt I anſwer, that ſince in a Countrie where the State is their adverſarie, and where for feare of ſcandale, and hope of gaining numbers to their Church, (to help both to the ſuretie and ornament of it) by commending their Doctrine by their lives; in likelyhood they are more vigilant againſt vice, then where they have no ſuch thornes againſt their breſts to keep them awak, even here I can find no ſuch advantage as you pretend, I have no cauſe to gueſſe that I ſhould find it where the incitement of emulation and ſuch like, are abſent, and the charmes of greatneſſe, wealth, power, and by conſequence likelyhood of impunity are preſent: For the advantage of learning, I anſwer, that ſpeaking to me with the fore-knowledge of my being unlearned, I wonder you ſhould make

uſe of ſuch a motive, which (how true ſoever it were in it ſelf) I am not capable of diſcerning to be ſo, any more then a blind man is likely to aſſent to an argument drawn from Colours, of which he could have no poſſible notion. Now whereas you ſay that the world was once of this accord, it is more then I know: we are told that whole Churches in the *Eaſt*, had long denied this, when *Luther* firſt left you, and howſoever that it could not be brought in time by arts, propt by power to accord in an error, is more then you have proved. Whereas you ſay, that thoſe, who oppoſed this, when they firſt parted, firſt began the contrary Sects: I anſwer, that our men pretend that they began no new Doctrine, but onely ſcoured off the ruſt which time and worldly ends in ſome, and negligence in others, had ſuffered to grow on. Which Queſtion againe remaines to be tried, (if you refuſe Scripture, as your ſide uſeth to do) by a Jury of ſuch who are for the moſt part untranſlated, or thoſe which are by Parties) and whoſe language I cannot ſpell, nor conſequently determine by their evidence: Now whereas you ſay, that the points in controverſie on your ſide help Devotion, and on ours diminiſh it, I wiſh you had inſtanced which, and wherein, for I for the moſt part ſee nothing towards it, they being meere ſpeculative opinions, and not reduceable to life, as eſpecially this whereof we moſt differ, which is your Churches being a generall guide: Thoſe, which moſt may ſeem ſuch, are either Confeſſion, (which yet we denie onely to be neceſſary, not profitable, if well uſed, which

which is practiſed by ſome of us, and recommended to all, and which as you have tempered it, making contrition ſufficient for his ſalvation, who hath till his hour of death lived in all ſin, and making attrition with abſolution of the ſame force as contrition, and requiring to attrition, (as I am told you do) onely ſorrow for ſin, though ariſing from the feare of Hell, ſo ſome love of God being joyned to it, which none can want but an Infidell) will not help Devotion much, but rather diminiſh it) or Monaſtick life, (which was grown into great exceſſe and diſorder, which yet many wiſe and moderne Proteſtants think might as well have been reformed as the other parts of the Church, without totall obolition, and ſo upon this is leſs no Queſtion) or Faſting, (which if you think Proteſtants are againſt, I pray read Biſhop *Andrews* his Lent Sermons, and which if it be not ſo much uſed among us as it ſhould, is not ſo much the fault of the Religion, as of the Men) and all theſe things conſidered, I find none of your motives to ſhew a maine advantage on your ſide, and therefore I have yet no cauſe to leave my owne: And if in ſome of theſe things you ſhould ſeeme to have more Truth then we, yet that would not free you from having more error in other points then this comes to, much leſſe from having any at all, without the beliefe of which, I ſhould not be received among you, though I were willing to come: And this lieth upon you to prove, and that not by probable, but by infallible arguments, if you require (as they ſay your ſide uſeth to do) an aſſent of that Nature.

To

Object. *To the Grammarian I will give two Memorandums; first, that ſeeing the Catholicks were firſt in poſſeſſion both of the Scriptures, and the Interpretations: The adverſe part is bound to bring ſuch places as can receive no probable Expoſition by the Catholickes. For who knoweth not, that is converſant in Criticks, how many obſcure and difficult places occurre in moſt plaine Authors, and the Scripture of all Bookes (the greater part of the men that wrote them, eſpecially the New Teſtament, being not eloquent, and writing not in their native Tongue) for the moſt part, are ſubject to much impropriety: The other Memorandum is, that, to prove a Catholique point by Scripture, it is ſufficient, that the place brought, beare the Expoſition the Catholique giveth, and if it be the more probable by the very letter, it is an evincent place. The reaſon is, becauſe the queſtion being of a Chriſtian law, the Axiome of the Juriſts taketh place, that* Conſuetudo optima Interpres Legis, *ſo that if it be manifeſt, that Chriſtian practiſe (which was before the controverſie) bee for the one ſence, and the words be tolerable, no force of Grammer can prevaile to equalize this advantage: The Grammarian therefore, who will obſerve theſe Rules, I turne him looſe to the Scriptures and Fathers, to ſeeke there what is the Faith of Chriſt and propreties of her Church to know her by.*

Reſp. To your firſt Memorandum, I anſwer, that you have grounded it wholly upon begging the queſtion: for if thoſe of your Religion had firſt been in poſſeſſion of the Scriptures, then the Chriſtians had been of it in the Apoſtles times, which

which if you could prove, you would need to prove no more, but all would easilie follow: and then for your consequence, that is equallie false, for though I confesse, to make any Doctrine a point of Faith, it is required, that the place be as plaine as you please, yet to the making it the more probable opinion (and consequentlie excluding the contrarie from being necessarie) so much is not required. The greatest cause of the obscuritie of those bookes, in which Criticks are conversant, is the negligence and ignorance of Transcribers, so that some Authors would scarce know their own Bookes, if they were revived, whereas the great care of Christians about so deare a pledge, hath much, if not wholly hindered, the same cause from perverting, and so obscuring Scripture: At least, if it have not, it seemes your Church is not so faithfull a Guardian of her depositt, as her deare friends (moved by partiallitie or ends) would make us beleeve: Besides, till now I ever thought, that Eloquence rather lead men to speake improperlie, then the want of it, since ignorant persons keepe themselves within the bounds of what precisclie they meane, whereas the eloquent wander into figures, which are so many, and have gotten such footing in language (whilst in the search of significancie proprietie is lost) that those, who use them, are obliged to those who will please to understand, because all they say may beare two sences, the one proper, the other improper: And though it be true, that they have over-flowne, even into the language of the ignorant, yet it is as true, that

that both they are much leſſe uſed among theſe, and that they had not hence their beginning, but from Eloquence: And though the Apoſtles write not in their native Tongues, yet they write in an inſpired language, ſo that they were not likely to commit, at leaſt, any ſuch ſolœciſmes as ſhould deſtroy the end of the Inſpirer, which was, that they ſhould be underſtood by it.

To your ſecond Memorandum I anſwer, that ſince every man is free till ſome thing binds him, you (who pretend, that we are bound to receive more doctrine as neceſſarie, then appeares to us to be ſo) are in all reaſon to give us plainlie evincent proofe, that what you thus require, God requires too, for till then (to returne you to another Axiome, for yours) *præſumitur pro libertate*; whereas wee (the burden of the Negative proofe not lying upon us) if we bring probable Arguments, we doe it *ex abundanti*, and bring more then we need to bring; And whereas you ſtand upon Cuſtomes, having power in Law matters, I anſwer, that in all caſes that is not of force, for we hold, that it muſt not prevaile againſt a Statute, which ſhewes, that they may be contradictorie, and as *Nullum tempus occurrit Regi*, is thought to be a good civill topicall Law, ſo me thinkes, *Nullum tempus occurrit veritati*, is a good publique divinitie Law, your owne Scripture too telling us, that Truth is ſtronger then the King; Beſides, where it is of force, it is in ſuch caſes as the law hath appointed that it ſhould be ſo, and if you can prove out of Chriſts Law, that there it is ſo appointed

pointed to be in matters of Divinity, wee ſhall willinglie yeild, but ſeeing that our law, which allowes this force to cuſtome, ſets downe alſo in how long time it is, before it become of force, and I have cauſe to thinke, that Chriſt would have been as carefull as our law, and have ſet down this too, if he had had any ſuch meaning, and if it were ſetled to be a cuſtome of ſuch a ſtanding (as by Saint *Auſtine* ſometimes is ſpoken of) as that in no time it be known that ever it was otherwiſe; in moſt of your affaires this would ſtead you a little, though one ſide have burnt the evidences of the other, to which in likelihood you owe it, if this ſtead you in any; of queſtions, whereof Scripture and Antiquitie are wholly ſilent, or meerly ſpeculative, and unreducible unto act (of which ſort are the greateſt between us) or not concerning the lawfulneſſe, but the neceſſity of an Action, to the firſt kind no ancient cuſtome can belong, nor other to the others then a cuſtome of Interpretation of ſome text concerning it, not enough to conclude upon (beſides, that it is not that which you ſpeake of) ſince daily your men differ, and defend their differing from all that went before them, about more then many texts, as *Cajetane*, *Salmeron*, and *Maldonate* ſhall beare me witneſſe, unleſſe, like *Sampſon*, you may breake thoſe Ropes by which others muſt be bound: And adding to all this, that our cuſtome may ſerve to ſhew the meaning of the law, when our ſelves were Authors of it, though not when God is, and that our generall cuſtome arguing our united conſent (which

onely gives force to our lawes) may be as fit to bind, as a law in civill caſes, and yet not in divine, where the lawes proceed from a higher fountaine, that ſuch a rule may be good in civill reſolutions, which require but probable proofes, and yet not in divine ones, where (according to the grounds of your Party, which requires an undoubting aſſent to her doctrines as infallible) infallible proofes are neceſſary, eſpecially this, like other Topycall arguments, having onely force *cæteris paribus*, and againe good where it is not ſo neceſſary, that the will of the Legiſlator be followed, as that peace and quiet be preſerved, to which, all alterations, even to the better, are enemies, and yet not in theſe caſes, where we are to preferthe will of our Law-maker before any humane convenience, or good, if the cuſtome paſt unqueſtioned, when the Law was firſt promulgated, but not, if crept in after by negligence, or plainely appearing to have been brought in by power, all this perſwading me not to be ſo farr ſwaied by your Rules as you would have me, I ſuppoſe you have ſmall hope, that not being ſo, I ſhould find either in Scripture, or the firſt Antiquitie, either that Faith which your Church propoſeth, or theſe properties of Chriſts Church, by which your Church proves, or rather ſtrives to prove, that ſhe it is: Give me leave beſides to aske you one Queſtion, and that is, What we ſhall conclude when the Chriſtian practice of ſeverall places have ever differed, as that of *Greece* from that of *Rome*, which it may alſo do in more places then

we

we are acquainted with, the extent of Chriſtianitie being unknown to us, as are the cuſtomes of ſome remote Chriſtian Countries which we know.

Of the Philoſopher, I exact to goe like a Philoſopher, and to ſearch out the ſpecificall differences of every Sect, and when he hath found them (if any one but the Catholique hath any rule of faith and good life, which I remit to him to enquire) but at leaſt, when he hath found the Catholicks to be this claime of Tradition before declared, then if this doe not bring him as demonſtratively as he knoweth any Concluſion in Philoſophy, and Mathematicks, to the notice of this, is the onely true Church of Chriſt, for my part I ſhall quit him before God and Man. Object.

I have examined the differences between all parts as you bid me, and find the Proteſtants to have a ſufficient rule of Faith, and good life, yea ſuch a one as by Maſter *Knotts* confeſſion, (*Quem honoris cauſa nomino*) is as perfect as a writing can be: And ſince a writing may containe all Doctrines, and onely cannot give teſtimonie to it ſelf, nor be *arbitrum &*, I have no reaſon to think it inferior to that of their adverſaries: Your claime of Tradition I ſee plainely enough, and as plainely, that it is but a claime, many of your ſide overthrowing it, and others not of your owne, pretending to it: Biſhop *Fiſher* confeſſeth, that Scripture and Miracles brought in the Doctrine of Purgatory, and that againe the doctrine of Indulgences. *Reſp.*

Eraſmus, who though himſelf no Martyr, yet one who may paſſe for a Confeſſor, having ſuffe-

red, and long by the Bigotts of both Parties, and a dear Friend both to *Fisher*, and his Colleague in Martyrdome, Sir *Thomas Moore*, (who were the *Deucalions* of learning in this our Country) makes yet a larger confession. *Non obscurum est quot opiniones invectæ sunt in orbem per homines, ad suum Quæstum callidos, conflictorum Miraculorum præsidio*: These reasons alone (allowing for brevities sake that I had no more) would make me believe, not onely that what you say concludes not geometrically, but perswades not probably, and consequently, you by your promise have quitted me, which without it I doubt not but God would have done.

Object. *The Divine, if he hath truly understood the Principles of Faith in the nature of a Divine, I mean Trinity, Incarnation, Redemption, Eucharist, Beatitude, the Creation and Dissolution of the World, and hath seen the exact conformity of the deepest Principles of Nature, with an unspeakable wisdome of the Contriver: If he doth not plainely confesse it was above the naure of man to frame the Catholique Religion, and seeth not that onely that is conformable to Nature, and it self, I say, he hath no ground sufficient to be of it.*

Resp. Supposing the greatest part of what you say to be true, (for I see not how a bare consideration even of these Doctrines will serve to prove them to come from Gods Revelation) it might prove the Christian Religion against *Pagans*, but for yours against *Protestants*, I can draw out of it no Argument, which if upon your explanation, it appeares

peares not to be throngh the default of the *Lymbeck* (which I expect) then the better I think of you, the worſe I ſhall think of your cauſe, which would have miniſtred to ſo ſharp an inquirer, better prooſes, but that the old *Axiom* hindered it of, *Nihil dat quod non habet* : Theſe Principles of Faith you ſpeak of, are agreed on by both Parts, ſo out of their Truth, and the impoſſibility of their being forged, all the other points cannot be proved, which have upon them no neceſſarie dependance : and that your Religion is conformable to the deepeſt Principles of Nature, I am ſo farr from ſeeing, that I conceive your own opinion of Tranſubſtantiation contradicts them almoſt all : Neither ſee I any ſuch unſpeakableneſſe in the contriving, but that ordinary underſtandings by ſeverall degrees, in a long tract of many ignorant negligent ages, egged on by ambition, cloakt over by hipocriſie, aſſiſted by falſe miracles, and maintained by tyrannie, might eaſily both induce and eſtabliſh them, ſo that though we have hitherto differed in our premiſſes, yet we meet in the Concluſion, which is, that I have no ſufficient ground to be of your Religion.

Object.

The Stateſman, who is truely informed of the Church, how farr is really of Chriſts inſtitution, and what either pious men have added, or peradventure ambitious men encroacht, if he doth not find a government of ſo high and exotick ſtraine, that neither mans wit dare to have attempted it, neither mans power would poſsibly have effected it; If he find no eminent helpes, and no diſadvantage to the temporall govern-

government, I shall think there wants one starr in the heaven of the Church to direct these Sages to Bethlehem.

Resp. I answer now in the person of a Statesman, (a part which but for this occasion, I'am sure never to have acted) Thus,

I find so much policie in your Church, for most part really, and alwaies in *voto*, aimed at, although miss'd, that of no body of men did ever *Aristotl*'s saying appear to me truer, παρ' ἐνίοις τῆς πολιτείας οὗτος ὁρος τῶν νόμων ἵνα δεσπότωσι τῶν πέλας, Among some men it is the end of the Lawes of their Commonwealth to be masters of their neighbours, but I find nothing in the government that should prove it, to proceed from a divine fountaine: In Ecclesiasticall Monarchie you have, so have also the *Turks*, the Pope pretends to a power of ending all controversies, so doth also their Mufty, and since mans wit attempted that, and mans power effected it, why it might not do the same in the West it did in the East, (having the aide of some Tinsell-reasons, and some not wholly averse places of Scripture) I cannot conceive: And what help is by your Church given to temporall government, I see not, unlesse giving the Pope power in temporalls, even to depose Kings be the helpes you mean: I know that some of your side are not concerned in this, but it is grown so generall, that though it be as yet no necessary part of your Religion, it is like to be shortly; And truely throughout I find somethings which pious men have added, many, whic hambitious men have encroacht, (though

of

of your Church I could not be informed in this, who hath not decided the Queſtion) but nothing that you alone hold inſtituted by Chriſt, and ſo to your *Bethlehem*, for want of a ſtarr I am not likely to travell.

Object. *Let every man conſider which is the fit way for himſelf, and what in other matter of that way he accounteth evidence, and if there be no intereſt in his ſoule to make him loath to believe, what in another matter of the like nature he would not ſtick at, or heavie to practiſe what he ſeeth clearly enough; I feare not his choice; but if God ſend him time and meanes to proſecute his ſearch any indifferent while, it is long agoe known of what Religion he is to be of.*

Reſp. I ſee yet no cauſe to think that your Religion is that which will be choſen, though we agree about the ſtate, in which every enquirers ſoule ought to be, and in which thoſe of few are; I ſee all parents labour to fix opinions into their Children before they come to an age fit to judge of any greater doubts, then what may happen at ſpan-counter, or cherry pit, and they againe ſeldome labour to ſet right what Education hath ſwaied: Neither are they wrought upon onely by prejudice, but ſome becauſe of gaine like *Demetrius*, ὅτι ἐκ ταύτης τ ἐργασίας ἡ εὐπορία ἡμῖν ἐστι, becauſe by this craft they have their Gods, ſome becauſe of temporall honour, like the *Phariſees*, ἵνα μὴ ἀπὸ συναγωγοὶ γένωνται, leaſt they be caſt out of the Synagogue, loving the praiſe of men more then the praiſe of God; ſome for feare like the High Prieſts, ἐλεύσονται οἱ ῥωμαῖοι, καὶ ἀροῦσιν ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν τόπον καὶ τὸ ἔθνος,

The

The *Romans* will come and take away both our Place and Nation; Some becauſe of the contradiction in the true Doctrine to their vaine or wicked deſires, and ſo as ſome Diſciples ſaid, though ſomewhat upon another occaſion, they account it, σκληρὸν λόγον, a hard ſaying, (which made *Epictetus* ſay, τοὺς μαλακοὺς οὐκ ἔστι προτρέψας ῥᾴδιον, οὐδὲ γὰρ τύρον ἀγκίστρῳ λαβεῖν, indeed moſt Chriſtians, who oppoſe any of Chriſts Commands, either for ſome of theſe reaſons, dare not enquire whether Chriſt hath commanded them, φοβοῦνται ἐρωτῆσαι περὶ τοῦ ῥήματος τούτου, or enquiring find, but confeſſe it not, like thoſe I ſpoke of before, who ἐπίρευσαν ἀλλ' οὐκ ὡμολόγουν: As *Epictetus* therefore ſaith, that we ſhould enquire of God, who is our guide, as Travelers do of them they meet, οὐκ ἔχοντες ὄρεξιν πρὸς τὴν δεξιὰν μᾶλλον φέρειν ἢ τὴν ἀριστερὰν, having no deſire to turne rather to the right hand then to the left, or againe, as we enquire of our eyes concerning what is to be ſeen, οὐ παρακαλοῦντες αὐτοὺς, ἵνα ταῦτα μᾶλλον ἡμῖν δεικνύωσιν, not perſwading them to ſhew us one thing rather then another, ſo ſay I, ought we to goe to reaſon to find Gods will indifferent, which is Truth, or elſe we are likely very lazilie to ſeek what we are unwilling to find, and a probable argument for what we deſire, will ſeem a Demonſtration, and a Demonſtration againſt it ſcarce a probable Argument. This I inſiſt upon the more, becauſe I think we have more cauſe to put you in mind of this, then you us, being too little practiſed on both parts, but not moſt by yours, whereof the greateſt part commonly arrives not ſo farr, as at the fault of not

ſeeking

ſeeking as they ſhould, becauſe commonly they have not leave given them to ſeek at all: for beſides thoſe who neglect to ſeek and may, no Bible being allowed by you to moſt, as no Smith was ſuffered by the *Philiſtines* in *Iſrael*, they fearing leaſt the *Hebrews* ſhould make them ſwords and ſpeares, and you leaſt they ſhould make out of it, Arguments to perſwade them to revolt from you. It is no wonder if your Church, be like the Congregation in the *Acts*, ἐκκλησία συγκεχυμένη καὶ οἱ πλείους οὐκ ἤδεισαν τινὸς ἕνεκεν συνεληλύθεσαν, the moſt part know not why they are come together. And truely if thus it were not, if all had liberty to ſeek Truth, and if all who ſought it were indifferent in their ſeeking, and their judgments were abſolutely unbridled by their affections, and unſwaied by prejudice, I cannot perſwade my ſelf that ſo many could meet in thinking it fit to receive (for ſo they ſeem to me) ſuch impoſſible Doctrines upon ſuch improbable grounds, or to require a more then probable aſſent to but probable Doctrines, (allowing them to be ſuch) and ſhould not ſee what is grounded upon them, (if not impoſſible) is at leaſt much more improbable, then the Motives are probable, which kind of Aſſent cannot be expected by God, who as he requires onely λατρείαν λογικὴν, a reaſonable ſervice, ſo alſo λογικὴν εἶναι, a reaſonable Faith.

Here followeth the Third Part of this Diſcourſe, which is a Reply to ſuch Anſwers as you have been pleaſed to make to a little of that little, which I at firſt oppoſed.

Reſp. *SPeaking of the Church* Rome, *as this day it is the true Church of God. I anſwer the doubter, ſhe neither hath, nor can have any error which he need to feare, and be ſhie of.*

The which two limitations I adde, for avoiding Queſtions impertinent unto our buſineſſe.

The firſt, for thoſe which concerneth the connexion of the Sea of Rome *to the Univerſall.*

The latter, to avoide ſuch Queſtions as touch that point, whether the Church may erre in any Philoſophicall or other ſuch matter, which Queſtions are not ſo pertinent to our Matter.

Repl. Meaning by the true Church a companie of men, which hold all (and no more) that Chriſt taught (for other interpretation, I beleeve, you will not give it) then there is no queſtion, but that not onely it hath no dangerous error, but none at all; but that yours is ſuch remaines unproved, and I beleeve, *manet æternumque manebit.* For upon examination, I doubt not, it will appeare, that as I have read of a Cohort of *Perſians*, which they called σπειρὰν ἀθάνατον, the Immortall Cohort, which all died in one battell; ſo your infallibe Church

Church will be found to abound in errors, and to belie equallie her title, being troubled her selfe, with what she undertakes to secure others from, like the Apothecary in *Lucian*, who undertaking to cure all men of the Cough, αὐτὸς μεταξύ σπῶμενος ὑπόβηχος ἐφαίνετο, could himselfe scarce prescribe his Medicine for coughing the while. Besides, of what sort soever the error be, yet since the Condition of her Communion is to professe a beleife that she hath none, such a one as to them, who indeed beleeve so, would not be dangerous, yet to me, who cannot professe this but against my Conscience, how slight a one soever, may be an occasion of damnation: Againe, as to me your answer appeares false, so to those of your own side it will appeare hereticall; to me it would give no satisfaction (though you had proved what you but affirme) because I desire to know an eternall, not a temporarie Guide, whereas if in your Church there should happen any Schisme, your answer then would give me no meanes to resolve my selfe which part were the guide (that is the true Church) withont a new, and peradventure (by the way) an endlesse search. To them it will give scandall, because, first, you presuppose that we must know the Church by the Doctrine, and the Doctrine by the Church; and secondlie, you imply a possibilitie, that the Church of *Rome* is now but by accident (and may come not to be) the true Church, and so all their confidence built upon her, as the Directresse of all Churches, and the eternall Admirall of Gods

Fleet will appeare to have a very fallible foundation: Besides, in the cause of your Limitation I find more reason to commend your Discretion, then your Ingenuitie: for, for the first, if you had said, that the Universall Church of Christ must alwaies be connected to the particular one of *Rome*, which were to allow her Infallibilitie, you knew Antiquitie to have said much against you; and besides, that this being not yet *de fide* among your selves (nor evident in it selfe) could not serve for a foundation to the whole bodie of our faith; if you had absolutelie denied it, you knew, that you should incurre the displeasure of the most prevailing part of your own men, and that then the maine (and to the Ignorant the onely visible) signe would bee taken away. For the second, if you had affirmed, that the Church could erre in nothing, how slight soever, you would both have contradicted many of your own side, as *Stapleton* by name, and have asserted more then there were any colour of proofe for, and would have wanted this distinction to retire to: if you were confuted in any particular, if you had restrained her Infallibilitie to things necessarie, or weightie, or the like, then the question would again have risen, which are those (for many errors, which we lay to her charge, concerne not things indeed necessarie, though she adde to the error, that other of thinking; that whatsoever she holds becomes necessarie by her holding it) and then for all you have said, the doctrine of Purgatorie might be false, and yet she the Church, and that infallible,

as

as farre as by your Doctrine her Infallibilitie had need to be extended.

Neither doe I remit the queſtioner to Scripture for his ſatisfaction, although I hold Scripture a very ſufficient meanes to ſatisfie the man, who goeth to it with that preparation of underſtanding and will wh'ch is meet and required. Howſoever this I may anſwer for them who prove it out of Scripture, that becauſe they diſpute againſt them who admit of Scripture, and deny the authority of the Church, if they can convince it, they doe well, though they will not themſelves admit generally of a proofe out of Scripture, as not able to prove every thing in foro contentioſo. Reſp.

If you hold Scripture to be ſo ſufficient a mean, I wonder, Sir, why you thinke not fit to remit me to it, unleſſe you thinke, that you have ſeverall ſufficient waies to prove ſo evident a Truth by, or thinke me not to come with meet preparation: Indeed if that be (as among you it is counted) to come reſolved, not to judge of what the *Roman* Church holds, by what the Scriptures ſay, but to beleeve, that they ſay whatſoever ſhe holds, then I confeſſe, I come not with the Conditions required; but if it be to come deſirous to finde the Truth, and to follow and profeſſe it when I have found it, in ſpite of all temporall reſpects, which might either fright or allure me from ſo doing, then I ſuppoſe, that Charitie (which hopeth all things) will encline you to beleeve, that I come as I ought to come, untill ſome evident reaſon perſwade you to the contrarie: That the Scripture *Repl.*

cannot

cannot prove every thing in *foro contentioſo* I beleeve, but all neceſſarie Truths, I beleeve it can; for onely thoſe, which it can, are ſuch: I denie not, but that a contentious perſon may denie a thing to be proved, when his own Conſcience contradicts his words, but ſo he may Arguments drawn from any other ground as well as Scripture, ſo that if for that cauſe you refuſe to admit of proofes from thence, you might as well for the ſame, refuſe to admit of any by any other kinde of Arguments: And certainlie, if the Scriptures (I meane the plaine places of it) cannot be a ſufficient ground for ſuch and ſuch a point, ſurelie it cannot be a ſufficient ground to build a ground upon, as the Churches Infallibilitie, and therefore, though it it ſeemes you deſire ſo much that this be beleeved, that ſo it be, you care not upon what proofe, yet a conſidering Proteſtant, who is not as hot to receive your Religion, as you are that he ſhould, may preſentlie ſay, when he is preſs'd by you with Scripture to this, ſince this is a way of proofe which your ſelves admit not of, an Argument from hence may bring me from my own Religion, but never to yours, becauſe it is a beame which that relies much upon, that by any other way, then the authoritie of the Church, no man can be ſufficientlie ſure of the meaning of Scripture.

Reſp. *That they ſay, the Church is made infallible that we may have ſome guide, I thinke it very rationall; for Nature hath given ever ſome ſtrong, and uncontroulable Principle in all Natures to guide the reſt. The Common-wealth hath a Governour not queſtio-*

queſtionable, our Underſtanding hath Principles which ſhe cannot judge, but by them judgeth of all other verities. If there ſhould not be ſome Principle in the Church, it were the onely maimed thing God had created, and maimed in its Principall part, in the very head. And if there be ſuch a Principle, the whole Church is Infallible by that, as the whole man ſeeth by his eyes, toucheth by his hands.

Chriſt is our unqueſtionable, and infallible Governour, and his Will the Principle by which we are guided, and the Scripture the place where this Will is contained, which if we endeavour to find there, we ſhall be excuſed, though we chance to miſſe, and therefore want not your guide, (who either is not, or as hard to find as the way: and againe, when he hath defined, the certaine meaning of that definition, as hard to find as herſelf.) Neither is a company of men thus beleeving, maimed in the head, though having no other more uncontroulable Principle: If your guide were evident of her ſelf, as thoſe Principles are by which we judge all things elſe, then your Similitude would hold a little, whereas being neither knowable in her ſelf, nor proveable by ought elſe, what you have ſaid onely ſhewes, what an ill match is made, when Witt is ſet againſt Truth. *Repl.*

It is ſufficient for a Child to believe his Parents, for a Clown to believe his Preacher about the Churches Infallibility: For Faith is given to mankind, to be a meanes of believing, and living like a Chriſtian, and ſo he hath this ſecond, it is not much matter in what tearmes he be with the firſt. *Reſp.*

To

Repl. To what you ſay, I anſwer, that I confeſſe that it is not poſſible that without particular Revelations, or Inſpirations, the ignorant, even of the Orthodox party, ſhould receive their Religion upon very ſtrong grounds, (which makes me wonder, that even from them you ſhould exact an aſſent of a higher nature, and a much greater certaintie, then can be miniſtred to them by any arguments which they are capable of) yet if they believe what they receive, with an intention of obedience to God, and ſuppoſall that their opinions are his Revelations, and uſe thoſe meanes which they in their Conſcience think beſt to examine whether they be or no, (though it be when they find themſelves unable to ſearch, by truſting others whom they count fitteſt to be truſted) I beleeve they are in a very ſaveable eſtate, though they be farr from having of the truth of their Tenets any Infallible certaintie; and the ſame I think of thoſe which are in error, for ſince you cannot deny, but that a Child, or a Clown, with the ſame aptneſſe to follow Gods will, may be taught by his Parents, or his Preacher, that what God forbids, he commands, that Chriſt's Vicar, is Antichriſt, or the Church, *Babylon*, and ſcarce teacheth any truth, though it could not teach the leaſt error; why ſhould ſuch a one be damned for the misfortune of having had Hereticall Parents, or a deceiving Preacher: For no more it ſeemes is required of ſuch, then to give his beliefe to thoſe; (And indeed the ſame reaſon extended, will excuſe him, who though learned, impartially

impartially aimeth at Gods will and misseth it) for though you seeme to insinuate, by the cause you give of what you say, that so men believe and do what they heare God command, he careth not upon what grounds, yet I, who know that God hath no other gaine by our so doing, then that in it we sacrifice to him our soules and affections, cannot believe, but that they shall be accepted who give him that which he most cares for, and obey him formally, though they disobey him materially, God more considering and valuing the Heart then the Head, the end then the actions, and the fountaine then the streames; And truely else he who through stupidity or impotence abstained from any vice, or through negligence or prejudice miss'd some error, would be as well accepted of by God, as he that by a care of his waies and of obedience to him who should rule them, did avoide the first, and by a studious search, the second.

I cannot part from this Theame without one consideration more, and that is, that if so Fallible a Director as you speak of, may be cause enough of assent to one Truth, why may they not be so to another, and why shall not the beleefe of our ignorants, upon their testimonie, that the Scripture is the Word of God, be as well founded, as that of yours to the Infallibility of the Church upon the same? And yet it is daily objected to us, that this beleefe of ours is not surely enough founded, since not received from their Church, although the unlearned among us receive

it from their Parents and Preachers, and the learned from Tradition; as from the firſt of thoſe your unlearned do, and from the ſecond of which your learned pretend they do receive the authority, and infallibility of the Church it ſelf: Although we be ſo much more reaſonable then you, that we require them not to be ſo ſure upon it, as they are of what they know by ſence, but onely to give them ſo much credit, that they may give up their hearts to obedience.

Reſp. *Neither do I remit him to a generall and conſtant Tradition, as if himſelf ſhould climbe up every age by learned Writers, and find it in every one I take it to be impoſsible teſtimonies one may find in many ages, but ſuch as will demonſtrate and convince a full Tradition I much doubt: Neither do I find by experience, that who will draw a man by a rope or chaine, giveth him the whole rope or chaine into his hands, but onely one end of it, unto which if he cleave hard, he ſhall be drawn which way the rope is carried. Tradition is a long chaine, every generation or delivery from Father to Son being a link in it*, &c.

Repl. Of this opinion I was wholly before, Firſt upon my own ſmall obſervation, (which alſo perſwaded me, that no controverted opinions had ſo much colour for ſuch a Tradition out of antiquity, as ſome which now are by both parts condemned. And after, by conſideration of what hath been ſo temperately learned, and judiciouſly writen by our Proteſtant, *Perron D' Aille*; But though I think that nothing is wholly provable by ſufficient teſtimonies of the firſt ages, to have had Primary

Primary and generall Tradition, (except the undoubted books of Scripture, or what is ſo plainly there, that it is not controverted between you and us) yet I think the Negative is eaſie to be proved, becauſe any one known perſon deſſenting, and yet then accounted a learned and pious Catholique, ſhews the Tradition not to have been generall, and that the Church of this Age differs from that of thoſe times, if it Anathematize now, for what then was either approved of, or at leaſt thought not ſo horrid but it might be borne with. And again, though we agree upon what will not ſerve to convince a full Tradition, yet we diſagree about what will ſerve; for allowing there were any controverted opinions delivered, with equall Tradition to the Scripture (which I deny to have beene, but would receive if it ſo appeared) yet ſure you beginne at the wrong end, in the examination of what thoſe are, which ought to be done, by conſidering the teſtimonies of the firſt ages, and not of the laſt, for in your own ſimilitude of a rope, though to helpe me to climbe by if, you put but one end into my hands, yet you muſt ſhew me, that the other end is ſomewhere faſtened, or elſe, for ought I know, inſtead of getting up by it, I may onelie get a fall, and this faſtening appeares not to me, till I be ſhewed ſome more certaine connexion between the Opinions of this Age, and thoſe of the Apoſtolicke times, then yet you have done, or till you have anſwered thoſe Arguments, by which, as I perſwade my ſelfe, I have made it appeare, that it cannot be done,

Resp. *As for the two places concerning the Popes and Councels Infallibillity, it is not to my purpose to meddle of them, because of one side the way I have begun, beareth no need of those discourses, and on the other, I should engage myselfe in Quarrels betweene Catholique and Catholique, obscure the matter I have taken in hand, and profit nothing in my hearers, more then to be judged, peradventure to have more learning, then wisedome to governe it withall.*

Repl. With your favour Sir, these places concerne, not onely questions between your selves, but between you and us; for I thought you had all agreed (though I knew you had not alwaies done so, and though it seemes by your declining to speak about it, that you doe not yet) that generall Councels, confirmed by the Pope, are infallible, and the Doctrines defined by them, are to be beleeved *de fide*, which if you be not, then the Glew, which it is so bragged, you have to keepe you still at Unitie, is dissolved and if you be, then you should both have answered upon what grounds you are so, and have destroyed my Objections against the possibilitie of certaintie, knowing when it is, that these (which used to be called the Church) have defined: finding therefore *Altum Silentium*, where there was so much cause of speaking, makes me beleeve, that the cause why you have not answered is, onely because you could not, and then you have a readie Apologie, that *Nemo tenetur ad impossibilia*, which I beleeve the rather, because I know, that to so cleare a judgement as yours,

that

that place of Scripture, *When two or three are gathered together*, &c. which is ſo often preſs'd for the Infallibilitie of Councels, muſt appeare to make as much for the Synod of *Dort*, as for the Councell of *Trent*, and to ſo great a learning as yours, it cannot be unknown how few (if any) of the Ancients have aſſerted their Infallibilitie, and how many, both of the Ancients, and your Modernes, have denied it; I am confirmed in this beleife too, becauſe you, I know, would never have accepted that as a ſufficient excuſe from me, if I had avoided to anſwer an Argument ſo, becauſe Proteſtants are not agreed upon the point, if you had thought it ſuch, as that they ought to have been agreed upon it, and truelie this is as great and conſiderable a queſtion, as any among us.

As for the two places of Fevardentius, *which alloweth many Fathers to have fallen into errors, I thinke it will not trouble him who is accquainted with the courſe of this preſent Church, wherein divers, who be thought great Divines, fall into errors, for which their Bookes are ſometimes hindered from the print, ſometimes recalled, or ſome leaves commanded to be paſted up, the reaſon is, the multiplicity of Catholike Doctrine which doth not oblige a man to the knowledge of every part, but to the prompt ſubjection of the inſtruction of the Church, wherefore many men may hold falſe doctrine inculpably, not knowing it to be ſuch, even now after the learned labours of ſo many that have ſtrived to open and facilitate by Method, what is true, and what is falſe,* Reſp.

much

much more in the Fathers times, when there was great want of ſo many Compilers as theſe latter ages have produced.

Repl. First, What *Fevardentius* confeſſeth, proves plainlie that, for which I intended it, which was, the ridiculouſneſſe of proving their Doctrine to be true, by being conformable to that of the Fathers, and yet making themſelves Judges of thoſe Judges they appeale too, and confeſſing, that many of them erred in many points, which if they did, they might as well doe the ſame in thoſe about which we differ, although they agreed with you, and diſſented from us.

Secondlie, What both he confeſſeth, and you confeſſe with him, diſproves that way of knowing divine Truths which you propoſe, for neither the Doctors of the ancient Church (who were ſure more likelie to know what was then taken for Tradition, then any late Compilers) nor of the Modern, who had a mind to deliver truth, and trac'd and followed your way of finding it, could erre in points of faith, if *Qui docet ut didicit*, he that teacheth as he hath been taught, muſt ſtill be in the right, for publique Tradition, no learned man, at leaſt can be ignorant, not any man (ſay you) of what he was taught when a Childe, as the ſubſtance of his hopes for all eternitie, and ſo cannot in reaſon have his books either forbidden or paſted up, for delivering any thing contrary to it.

Secondly, Who are theſe Cenſors who forbid and paſte up books, certainly not the Univerſall Church

Church, nor yet the Repreſentative, the latter is not alwaies in being, nor when it is, at leaſure to conſider and judge all authors, and of the firſt theſe Authors are a part, if then they be fallible, (as they muſt be if they be not the Church) why may not they erre, and the Martyr-books ſpeake truth, which yet will eaſily by this meanes be kept from Poſteritie, if thoſe in the Dictatory Office diſſent from it as they will be ſure to do, if the opinion contradict never ſo little the power or greatneſſe of the Pope, upon whoſe favour theſe Oecumenicall Correctors muſt depend, or they not long remaine in their places: and yet you expect that your adverſary ſhould produce ſucceſſion of their opinions in all ages, though nothing be let paſſe but what a few pleaſe, and though when in time all of you are agreed (as you will ſoon be or appear to be, if one ſide appear to be gag'd) then this conſent, though thus brought about, becomes the conſent of the Church, and a very notable Motive.

And ſince you ſay, that what all are bound to, is onely a prompt ſubjection to the Church, why leave you it ſo in doubt, what is the Church, as if men were tyed to be ſubject, but muſt not know to what; you ſay indeed, that the adherers to the Church of *Rome* are now the Church, but what they may be, you will not plainely declare; So that if a Schiſme among them ſhould happen, we are all as farr to ſeek as if you had been wholly ſilent, for ſince the infallibility lies not in the particular Church of *Rome*, and conſequently the adhe-

ring

ring to her is not ever a ſufficient note of the Church, (as you will not ſay) nor is it among your ſelves *de fide*, ſince the Univerſall Church (whatſoever ſhe be) can never define any thing, and of the authority of the definitions of the Repreſentative, and of what conſtitutes both her and her decrees, you refuſe to ſpeak, what remaines there, to which this prompt ſubjection is to be the onely everlaſting Note of the true Church, but onely the Truth whenſoever ſhe appeares; Thus as the Prieſts of *Apollo* (therefore peradventure called *Loxias*) uſed to ſpread lies, and ſecure his reputation, the firſt by the antiquity, and the ſecond by the darkneſſe of his Oracles, ſo doth your Religion gaine upon many men, and ſecure her ſelf rom many objections, by the manyfold acceptions, and conſequently difficulty of this tearme Church; For whatſoever is ſaid in Scripture concerning her being free from all ſpot, or prevailing againſt the gates of Hell, or their danger who reſiſt her, the firſt meant (as I believe, and the place denies not by any circumſtance) of the Church Triumphant, the ſecond of the Church of the Elect, and the third, of the Profeſſors of Chriſtianity in generall, or at moſt of thoſe who are in all neceſſary points Orthodox among them; That they without ſufficient proofe reſolve to be ſpoken of the Church in their ſence they have fancied; That is, ſome ever known body of Chriſtians which muſt be ſtill guide to the reſt, and then claime to be that, becauſe no other (all elſe being more ingenious:) claimes it beſides themſelves, whereas

whereas, if (conſidering that ἀρχὴ παιδείας ἡ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐπίσκεψις, and the Oraculous truth of my great Lord *Bacon*'s obſervation, that unleſſe men in the beginning of their diſputes agree about the meaning of their tearmes, they muſt end about words, where they ought to have begun) they had marked what other ſence theſe words were capable of, (for if it will here beare another, then this cannot hence be concluded but by leave) they would then ſoon have ſeen the weakneſſe of their building, by the ſlightneſſe of their foundation. Againe, they prevaile much by working upon mens aſſents, by the meanes of their modeſties, and preſſe it to be an intollerable pride to oppoſe their opinions to the conſent of the Catholick Church; whereas, if it be weighed how ſmall a part of it they mean by that word, and yet of them how many follow blindly the decrees of one, and how ſoon thoſe prevaile againſt that few not backed by any power who do not, it will then appeare, that not onely other Churches, but even a *John* or a *Thomas* have as much reaſon to be lead by their own underſtandings, as by the opinions and decrees of and *Vrban* or a *Gregory*, upon which that conſent is ſo often founded; And as they make their advantage of this word in their offenſive warres, ſo do they in their defenſive, for when they are preſs'd unto the abſurdity of their Tenets, then (though indeed they be generall) yet they pretend, that they are the opinions but of private, though many men, and not of the Church; and againe, when any Fathers (who yet ſometimes they ſay

are wholly theirs) are ſhewed to contradict ſome of their Doctrines ſo plainely, that none of thoſe ſubterfuges, which in one of their expurgatory Indexes, they confeſſe they often uſe, will ſerve to palliate it; then they ſtrive to ſcape by anſwering, that the Church had not then defined it, whereas if it be examined, how farre they conſent about what is the Church, and what are her Definitions (whereof they are not yet agreed, for ſome ſay, ſhe hath defined what, others ſay, ſhe hath not) this onely will be certainlie found, that it never can be certainlie found, what are her opinions of any point, or when ſhe hath declared her ſelfe: As (beſides manie other Arguments, ſome preſs'd by my ſelfe, and others, by other Pens more fit to treat of ſo weightie a matter) appeares by your refuſing to leave your *Latibula*, and declare plainlie your opinion concerning it, which if you ſaw defenſible, and you were all agreed about it, you would quicklie have done, and not incurred the reprehenſion of that Axiome, which teacheth, that *Doloſus verſatur in generalibus*, which makes me thinke, that if this were generallie enough mark'd, you would no longer be able to dazle any mans eyes with the ſplendid title of Sonnes to the Catholique Church, as *Alexander* hoped to doe thoſe of the *Barbarians*, with ſtiling himſelfe Παῖς Διός, the Sonne of *Jupiter*, although indeed he was ſo much the more moderate then the ſecond, as never to denie, that any other could be Sonne to the ſame Father, whereas you will not allow, that any may have intereſt in your Mother beſides your ſelves.

To

To conclude this Paragraph, give me leave to aske one queſtion, and that is, how your ſaying, that Truth is more eaſie to finde now then in the Fathers times, will agree, either with the way which you ſay, is the onely Catholique one to finde Truth by (for ſure ſuch a Tradition was alwaies equallie eaſie to finde, and if the firſt ages had erred in it, we muſt of neceſſitie, following your advice, have followed their error too) or with the ſaying of ſo many of your ſide, that if I ſhould reckon them up, I ſhould make a Catalogue of Authors, equall to thoſe of *Photius*, or *Geſner*, or *Poſſevine*, who all joyne, that Truth was moſt likelie to be moſt certainlie known that time, which was, in *Campians* words, *Chriſto propior, ab hac ætate remotior*, neerer to Chriſt, and conſequentlie to Tradition, and to which, for that cauſe, all thinke fit to appeale againſt us, or with that cuſtome of your Church, which ſuffers none to take Orders before they have vowed to interpret Scriptures according to the Fathers, which if men now adaies be more likelie to find the Truth, then at that time they were (as they muſt be, if truth in this age be more eaſie to be found, whether through greater abundance of Compilers, or what elſe ſoever) then this Vow is as much, as if they had vowed to leave the beſt way of Interpretation and teaching, to follow the worſt.

Reſp. *As for the two points, he ſaith, avert him from Catholique doctrine, I am miſtaken, if he be not miſtaken in both. The firſt is, that the Catholiques doe damne all who are not in the Union of*

their Church. He thinkes the ſentence hard, yet I thinke he will not deny me this, that if any Church does not ſay ſo, it cannot be the true Church. For call the Church what you will; the Congregation of the Elect, the Congregation of the Faithfull, the Congregation of Saints, or Juſt; call it, I ſay, or define it what you will, doth it not clearly follow, that whoſoever is out of the Church cannot be ſaved, for he ſhall not be the Elect, Juſt, Faithfull, &c. without which there is no ſalvation. How then can any Church maintain theſe two Propoſitions, I am the true Church, and yet one may be ſaved without being in me:

Repl. This is, by your favour, a meere Paralogiſme; for though thoſe who define the Church by qualities, which both Parts agree, to be the conditionall Keyes to the Kingdome of Heaven, muſt needs affirme, that none out of the Church can be ſaved, yet what is this to them, who meane by the Church, the Companie of the Orthodox in all points, and by them your ſelves, out of which (allowing that there be ſuch a one, which I doubt of, and that to be yours) I ſhall beleeve, that ſome may be ſaved, till I ſee ſome more cauſe to thinke all error in Religion alwaies damnable, which it is plaine, by what after you ſay, that you thinke not your ſelfe, and the Church taken in this ſence, which is your ſence, may maintaine both Propoſitions; or to ſhew you, how much, what you ſay, would make againſt your ſelfe, thus I argue; The true Church muſt hold that none can be ſaved out of her, but your Church denies not, but that ſome

out

out of her may be ſaved, therefore yours is not the Church: My *Major* is included in your own ſaying, that thoſe two Propoſitions are not maintainable together: My *Minor*, though falſe, yet is alſo your confeſſion (where you ſay, that the Churches Propoſition is not ſo cruell as it ſeemes, though the words be rough) and therefore ſo ought you to make my concluſion too: Beſides, thoſe who exclude all from Salvation, who are out of the Church in the other ſence, meaning by it the Elect, as they are not like them in the wrong, ſo they are not occaſion of much harme, like them, who ſtiling the Church, a companie of men of ſuch a beleife, and under ſuch a government, affirme an impoſſibilitie of being ſaved out of it; for they giving no viſible ſigne of who is in the Church (for who can know the Elect, but the Electer) cauſe no want of Charitie, nor frequencie of Warre, and perſecutions by it, as the others doe; who having made firſt a viſible partition, leaſt thoſe who are out of it may draw others out too, they ſend them out of the world by way of prevention.

But per adventure he is ſcandalized, that the Catholick Church requireth actuall Communion externall with her, which he thinketh may in ſome caſe be wanting without detriment of Salvation. But how would he have the Church ſpeake, which ſpeaketh in common, but abſtracting from ſuch particular caſes as may change wholly the Nature of the Queſtion. Reſp.

I am ſcandalized, not becauſe you require to Salvation *Repl.*

vation joining with you in Communion, but becauſe alſo you require joyning with you in opinions, and if it were onely this, yet am not I any whit ſatisfied with what you ſay for it, for with the true Church, that is the Commpany of true believers, in points any way materiall (or rather the trueſt) I conceive it not damnation ſometimes not to communicate: For if they have any never ſo ſlight errors, and which appeares ſo to me, which yet they will force me to ſubſcribe to, if I Communicate with them, my aſſent would be damnable, or if they require the ſame ſubſcription to ſome truths, which yet after my reall indeavours in inquiry, appear errors to me, I doubt not but my refuſall is no way damnable: Neither can I abſolve your Church concerning this her ſaying for your reaſon, becauſe ſhe ſpeakes in generall, wholly abſtracting from particulars, which change the nature of the Queſtion, for why doth ſhe ſo, why doth ſhe not expreſſe her exceptions, or at leaſt tell us, that the rule is not ſo generall, but that it will beare ſome, and not make men (who know not that ſhe intends to reſtraine at all, what ſhe ſo abſolutely pronounceth, and who will find no cauſe to take your bare word for her intentions) many times, at leaſt to hate them as Gods enemies, whom he loves as his friends, and beleeve them to fry in Hell, who ſhine in Heaven? Howſoever if ſhe uſe to expreſſe herſelf in rougher words then her meaning is; how apt may ſhe be to be miſtaken in ſeverall of her reſolutions, and conſequently how eaſie is it for ſome age to have miſunderſtood the paſt, and deceive

ceive the following : Neither do I like your example, becauſe that is not to differ from the Church, but to miſtake her meaning, though even he, who ſhould denie that there were three Gods, if he thought that by the Trinitie your Church ſo meant, muſt conſequently think her not infallible, and ſo by your grounds be conſequently a Heretick.

Reſp. *The current of Catholick Doctors, that no man ſhall be damned for infidelity, but he who doth wilfully misbeleeve, and that to do ſo it is required that Faith be ſufficiently propoſed unto him, and what is to be ſufficiently propoſed, is not determined amongſt them. There wanteth not Divines who teach, that even* ignorantia affectata, *doth excuſe from Hereſie. On the other ſide it is moſt certaine, that no man is damned for not profeſſing, what he is not damned for not believing. Wherefore, profeſſion being that which engrafteth a man exteriorly in the Church, according unto the ordinary opinions of the Catholicks, it followeth, that no man is condemned for not being of the Church, who is not for infidelity, for which it is a very uncertaine Caſe who be damned, and who be not.*

Repl. As the King of *Spaine*, after long calling the *Hollanders* Rebels, at laſt for his own ſake deſcended to treat with them as free States, ſo thoſe of your Religion, when they hope to gaine a Proſelite, thunder out to him crudelity, and without any of theſe Mollifications which you now uſe, that *extra Eccleſiam Romanam nulla eſt ſalus*, there is no ſalvation out of the Roman Church. And Maſter *Knot* peremptorily avers, that no Catholick

tholick of an entire fame ever taught, that a Proteſtant ſo dying could be ſaved, yet when they are preſs'd with the conſequences, they can (as it ſeems) vouchſafe to give us better words, and find μαλάγματα enough to ſoften this opinion, though ſuch as bring them more diſadvantage in other conſiderations, then help in this. For firſt, as before it ſeemed that you are not fully agreed either about the authority of the councels, or what conſtitutes the Church, (by your avoiding to ſpeak concerning it) ſo now it ſeemes, that neither are you reſolved of what conſtitutes an Heretick, and then what remaines there for you to know, if what you account infallible and what damnable, be yet both uncertaine to you.

Secondly, Since you confeſſe none to be a Heretique, but he to whom the truth is ſufficiently propoſed, and when that is, you are not reſolved: what a more then *Sythian* Barbarouſneſſe is it to make a coale of a Chriſtian, onely upon ſuſpicion of Hereſie? eſpecially ſince the *Pagans* themſelves had Chriſtian Charity enough to perſwade them, that it was much better that a guilty perſon ſhould eſcape, then an innocent be puniſhed: much more ſhould you rather ſuffer the tares to grow, then venture to pluck up the corne with it, and beleeve the beſt, when the truth lies hid in a place ſo hard to ſearch into, as is the heart of man, into which (as none entered the *Sanctum Sanctorum* but the High Prieſt) God onelie can have admittance.

Reſp. *The other point was of putting Hereticks to death, which*

which I think he understandeth to be done vindicatively, not medicinally, I mean, imposed as a punishment, and not in way to prevent mischiefe, and oppresse it in the head.

I suppose it small satisfaction to a poor man, carried to the stake for his Conscience, to know by which member of a distinction he is put to death, and that this as little excuseth you, as it satisfies them, I hope to shew before we have ended the consideration of this present Paragraph. *Repl.*

If the Circumcelians *were the first, that is, ancient enough for the justification of the fact; although for Banishment, which also he seemeth to reprehend, we know the first that could suffer it did suffer it,* Arrius *I mean, by the hand of* Constantine, *whom he praiseth for a speech he uttered before he knew the consequence of the danger, and seemeth to reprehend for his after and better witts.* Resp.

I wish to you what *Erasmus* wisht to *Augustinus Steuckius*, which is, that you were but equall in *probando diligens*, as you are in *asseverando fortis*: For how unlikely is it that we should give you credit without proofe onely, ἀπόδειξιν φέροντι τὸ θάρσος, that the antiquity of a thing, which began so long after Christs Apostles, were all dead, is enough to prove it lawfull: Howsoever it would at most but prove it lawfull, to put such Hereticks to death, as force men to do so in their owne defence, for such were they: Besides I object not onely against this custome the not being ancient, (for I conconfesse there might have been before a power to do so too, though not used to the uttermost, *Repl.*

though in likelihood what perſwaded you to uſe it, would have perſwaded them to the ſame, if they had thought they had it) but as being alſo condemned by *Hillary*, and *Athanaſius*, and other Orthodox: For though ſome puniſhment of a leſſe degree were inflicted upon others too by their own ſide, (as you trulie inſtance) when their power prevailed; yet *Conſtantine* ſaies, not onely in an Edict for libertie of opinions, (which he, who was then Pope never appeared to ſtomack, as his ſucceſſor, undoubtedly would now doe the like) μηδεὶς τὸν ἕτερον παρενοχλείτω ἕκαστος ὅπερ ἡ ψυχὴ βούλεται τοῦτο καὶ πραττέτω, let no man trouble another, but let every one do as his own ſoule will: but alſo gives this concluding reaſon againſt you for it, ἀλλὸ γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸν ὑπὲρ ἀθανασίας ἆθλον ἑκουσίως ἐπαναιρεῖσθαι, ἀλλὸ τὸ μθὰ τιμωρίας ἐπαναγγάζειν. For it is one thing willingly to take upon them this combate for immortality, and another to force them to it with puniſhment; and ſo in whatſoever he did contrary to this in any caſe, wherein this reaſon held his words, condemne his action: And whereas you ſay, that when *Conſtantine* made ſo ſlight of the queſtion between *Arrius* and *Alexander*, it was, becauſe he knew not the conſequence of the danger: I ſhall deſire to know of you whether you muſt not confeſſe, that there is now no King of your Religion ſo ill inſtructed in it, (though none of them be never ſo learned or curious as *Conſtantine* was, who, if any man in his dominion ſhould ariſe, denying Tranſubſtantiation, would not preſently know the danger of the conſequence, and reſolve him

for

for an Heretick, and to the ſtake inſtantly, and not ſpeak againſt his opinion onelie as impertinent, and *de lana caprina*, and περὶ ὄνου σκιᾶς, and if this had been as reſolved a thing then among Chriſtians, to have come from Tradition, as Tranſubſtantiation is now amongſt Papiſts, he would neceſſarilie as ſoon have diſcovered it too: Howſoever I believe his after-witts to have been his worſer witts, in puniſhing, though not in condemning of *Arrius*, and to me it yet ſeemes (for to be ſure, not to ſpeak Heretically, I will not ſpeak obſtinately) that to have laboured in ſtopping of diſputes on both parts, and tying them to Scripture Phraſes, and to ſpeak of God onelie in the Word of God, had been at leaſt in reſpect of Unity, not a worſe way, then to have given an example to what after followed, I mean, the frequent explication (with *Anathema* to boote) of inexplicable miſteries; Neither would then ſo many queſtions have ſo long troubled the Church, which for their ſlightneſſe were unworthy ever to exerciſe the Schooles; But for that or any other meer error, as it may be for ought any one knowes, unlawfull in any to puniſh at all, I by no meanes like not to put to death, for the ſame ſeemes to me it ſelf ἁμαρτία ἁμάρτωλος καθ' ὑπερβολὴν, a ſin above meaſure ſinfull, though even the act of it proceeded from an opinion of doing God ſome ſervice, and that opinion from a meer error too, then I conceive but a materiall no formall ſin for the ſame cauſe, and ſo, neither this materiall Murtherer, nor that materiall Heretick, be guilty before God, who onely can diſtinguiſh,

and to whom it is fit to be left. Howſoever the long doubt of ſome, and oppoſall of other Orthodox to this courſe, and that ariſing not from their Policie or Compaſſion, but their Conſcience, not as thinking it unprofitable or unfit, but unlawfull, ſhews, that there was then no Tradition that the Apoſtles taught it to be lawfull ſo to uſe Hereticks, upon which onelie, all the Infallibilitie, which you claime for any beliefe or cuſtome of your Church, is founded.

Reſp. *Saint* Auſtine *juſtifieth ſuch proceedings againſt Hereticks.*

Repl. Truely for putting them to death (unleſſe when they firſt aſſaulted) which makes a wide difference, for then it was not done as to Hereticks, but as to *Aſſaſſines*; from whom Nature teaches us to defend our ſelves, and conſequentlie to re-offend them whenſoever Religion barres it not, experience ſhewing us the danger of meerly defending, to be neer to that too, of not doing it at all) I know not that ever he did, nor do I beleeve it: That ſome degree of puniſhment ſhould be inflicted upon them, I confeſſe he at laſt conſented, but chiefly to force them to come and ſee what the Church did, (whoſe actions the Hereticks impudently belied, as if they ſet pictures upon the altar, and did what you both doe and defend, and they did not) *i. e.* denied it. Howſoever we have Saint *Auſtine* againſt Saint *Auſtine*, and not onely his authority, but his reaſons more valid by much, then that when he ſaith, that ſuch oppreſſions would make them think themſelves *vi victos*, non

non veritate convictos, overcome by force, not convicted by Truth, and consequently dislikes it, *ne fictos Catholicos habeamus, quos apertos Hereticos novimus*, least they become from open Hereticks, but fained Catholicks: Reasons, which (though these be not all we have) in my opinion it was as impossible for him reasonably to answer when he was living, as it would be now for him to do it when he was dead. Besides, as he useth these strong arguments against it, so he is himself a strong example against it, for the Church had lost this her so notable Champion, if they then had been as severe to the *Manichees* as you are to us.

Saint Gregory *useth the like against* Pagans, (*if I remember*) *and the Church laterly hath rather encreased, then decreased in the practice of it.* Resp.

I believe your memory deceives you in this, which you have cause to hope it doth, for else the Church of *Rome* differs from that of Saint *Gregories* times, it being now with her a judged case, that Infidels may not be compelled to the Faith, as I am told is shewed by *Valentia*, Saint *Thomas*, *Hartado*, and others, the Church having no power over those who are out of it, and therefore they please to say, that (like them who among the *Romans* were onely *Cives ad onera*, liable to the taxes of Citizens, without Interest in their Priviledges) Baptisme hath made us of the Church enough to be liable to her Punishments, though not to be benefitted by her Communion: Though indeed the same cause why you would have *Repl.*

have Hereticks put to death, for feare of harming others with their opinions, me thinks should extend to their punishment too, unlesse you believe us to be as bad as Malefactors, and not them, or that their opinions are so irrationall as not likely to spread, and ours so reasonable, that against them the sword is the best shield, and therefore (as *Brennus* did his) you put that into the scales for want of weight, it being of giving Reasons as the Poet saith it is of giving Requitalls, *Iraſci quam donari vilius conſtat.*

Another reason which perswades me that you are mistaken in what you say of *Gregory*, (as this mistake facilitates my beliefe, that you are so about *Austines* too) is that *Bede* tells, that some *Romanists*, having converted the King of *Kent*, that King did not yet force any to become Christians, for (saith he) he had learned of these his Masters, that the service of Christ (WHICH REASON EXTENDS FARTHER THEN TO PAGANS) must be voluntary, and not forced; Now if these received what they taught from *Gregory*, (as you often tell us) then either he did not as you often say, or thought that unlawfull which himself did; And howsoever this Custome hath encreased since is very unconsiderable, for unlesse it have its authority explicitely or implicitely from the Apostles, it can give none since, and unlesse it be proved to be well done at first, no continuance can give this, or any other action more justification then at first it had.

Resp. Moses *speech I believe is mistaken, the force of it*

it being, that the banishment of Bishops shewed his faith, because the banished were Catholickes, which shewed Lucius *to be none.*

If *Moses* had meant as you would have him, he should not have said, onely τῶν ἐπισκόπων; but τῶν ἐπισκόπων τῆς καθολικῆς, not indefinitelie the banishing of Bishops, but the banishing of Orthodox Bishops, the leaving therefore of that out, wherein, according to you, the whole sence of his Argument lay, seemes to me plainlie enough to shew, that he meant what they and you denie: especiallie he adding (as you may see in *Zozomon*) their being punish'd by labour, as well as punishment, and then saying, ἅπαν τελῶς ἐστὶν ἀλλότρια χρι. ὁ καὶ τῶν ὀρθῶς περὶ θεοῦ δοξάντων, which things are whollie abhorring from Christ, and all right Beleevers concerning God, and in *Socrates*, δουλὸν γὰρ κυρίου οὐ δεῖ μάχεσθαι for Gods servant ought not to fight, for so he counted to punish. *Repl.*

But what can be said, if the Church useth that for the prevention of a greater and more dangerous evill, which all politique Estates use for the remedies of lesse, and lesse dangerous evils, and are commended for it. For if Faith be the way to Salvation, and Heresie be the bane of Faith; if Salvation the greatest good, then the danger of a Countries being over-runne with Heresie, is the greatest of dangers, greater then the multiplicity of Theeves, greater then the unsurety of the wayes, greater then a Plague, or Invasion; why then doth not reason force us to use meanes to prevent it, which the same reason and experience teacheth us to be most efficacious in this, and all Resp.

othe.

other contagious and gangrening maladies of the Common-wealth. I hope reaſon it ſelfe, and the Zeale of the Author to his own, and Countries ſalvation, will ſupply my ſhortneſſe in this point, for ſuppoſing a Church be aſſured ſhe is in the right, and that the doctrine preach'd, as then leadeth to damnation; I know not why Caiphas *his words ſhould not be propheticall in this caſe, and that truly it doth* expedire, *that* Unus moriatur pro populo, & non tota gens pereat.

Repl. I wiſh heartilie, you were as good a Caterer as a Cooke, I meane, that you brought as good reaſons as you dreſſe artificiallie what you bring; For I finde there is in your words a verie notable δίνωσις, able to ſteale a man into your opinion, before he hath askt himſelfe why; but if he ſtay to doe ſo, then all your excellent embroiderie will not keepe him from diſcerning manie bracks in your ſtuffe: To prove which, I will bring many reaſons (beſides what I have taught alreadie) by which it ſhall, I hope, appeare, why thoſe, whom you call Hereticks, ſhould not be put to death, although Malefactors may, although even the lawfulneſſe of that (ſince other puniſhments, which would not ſhorten their time of repentance, might peradventure ſerve to repreſſe them) is not abſolutelie certaine.

Firſt, Malefactors plainlie offend againſt their Conſciences, at leaſt, thinke not themſelves bound by them to commit their villanies (neither pretend they otherwiſe) which they, whom you call Hereticks, either *bona fide* follow, or doe for ought at leaſt you can know. Secondlie,

Secondlie, What are Malefices, muſt be known before Malefactors, and Hereſies before Hereticks; now of the firſt Mankinde agrees, but of the ſecond but you onely, a ſmall part of Chriſtians, and yet you differ too about the waies of knowing them, and conſequentlie, whether ſome things be Hereſie or no (as for example, whether the Oath of Alleagiance containe any) wherein ſince ſome of you are deceived, me thinkes it ſhould incline you to thinke it not impoſſible for you all to doe ſo, in what you all agree to be ſuch.

Thirdlie, Malefactors are not, or ſhould not be puniſhed for ſuch, without a plaine knowledge that ſuch they are; but although there were an impoſſibilitie of miſtaking what is Hereſie, yet there is no poſſibilitie of knowing who are Hereticks, the forme of which is obſtinacie, a ſecret, and (to man) an undiſcoverable qualitie, whom he onelie ſhould puniſh who onelie knowes.

Fourthlie, Malefactors are certaine to hurt others, whereas neither are Heretickes ſure to perſwade any, and if they doe, yet they may hurt none, ſince who receives their beleife *bona fide*, and through meer error, is unharmed by it.

Fifthlie, Whom they doe harme, it muſt be through their own fault, and by their own conſent, whereas without either, the Malefactors are cauſe of much miſchiefe, even to the moſt guiltleſſe.

Sixthlie, Malefactors paſſing whollie unpuniſh'd, peradventure not put to death, would bring a certaine deſtruction to the ſtate, which

temporall Magiſtrates are appointed to watch over, which yet in ſpeculative opinions is not concerned.

Seventhly, The puniſhment even by death, of Malefactors brings not any temptation of ſinning, upon them, the ſame to others is in all probabilitie a cauſe to keep many from a carefull ſearch of Gods Truth, (leaſt they might find the puniſhable beleefe to be the true one) and from profeſſing it, when they think they have found it; both which are ſinns of the firſt magnitude.

Eigthly, This courſe with Malefactors was not, for ought appears, ever thought unlawfull in the pureſt times of Chriſtianity, and was then in uſe, whereas towards errors in beleefe, it was diſallowed of them by the chiefe, and long before death was at all inflicted upon them, though then underſtood as well the danger of Hereſie, and were as carefull to preſerve their flocks from all danger by all lawfull waies, as any ſince.

Ninthly, It no way redounds to Chriſts Glory, that Malefactors be unpuniſht, but it makes much for it, that his Army appears to conſiſt of Volunteers, and not of Preſs'd men, that his Truth ſhould prevaile by no humane force, but onely by the power of the firſt teacher, and the light of the Doctrine, which for us unbidden ſo to aſſiſt, is to think the Arke muſt fall, if we hold not forth our hands to hold it up, and takes from it the honour of ſubſiſting by the way, by which it took roote, when (to borrow Saint *Chyſoſtomes* words) οἱ ἀσθενεῖς τῶν ἰσχυρῶν περιεγένοντο, καὶ οἱ δώδηκα τῆς οἰκουμένης.

The

The weak were to hard for the strong, and twelve for the World, and that γυμνοὶ πρὸς ἐνοπλοὺς ἀχόμενοι, They being naked, and their adversaries armed.

Tenthly, That death is the most effectuall way to suppresse Malefactors, you say reason and experience shewes, and it is generally agreed of; but in this case it seems even to your best men the worst course, as appears by *Iburranes* resolution concerning the *Hyper-Ephanians*, by the 267 Page of grave and judicious Cardinall *D' Ossat* his Letters, by the Epistle of Cardinall *Richelieu* to his King before a Book of Controversie, and by *Erasmus* his Testimonie, who tells us, that a *Carmelite* having then this power in his hands, *Ubicunque sævitiam exercuit* Carmelita, *ibi diceres fuisse factum Hæresεων sementum*, wheresoever he exercised his crueltie, he seemed to have sowed Heresie. All which reasons make me beleeve, that there is much difference between the striving to destroy these two sorts of men, and if there were not, yet for fore-touched reasons, and others which I will touch at, I should as soone think it unlawfull to put Malefactors to death, as lawfully to kill Hereticks. For indeed since ἄχμον μέγιστος ὁ φοβεῖται τοὺς ψόφους, it disadvantageth what you would aide; to seem to beleeve that truth, without other assistance, would not sooner roote out falshood, then that it, that the Orthodox are not more likely to cure the seduced, then to be infected by them; and that there is no way to end the Heresies, but by ending the Hereticks: And thus you runne into three inconveniencies.

Firſt, You put reaſonable ſcruples into conſidering mens minds, leaſt as a *Greek* Orator ſaith againſt *Ulyſſes* for ſtriking *Therſites*, τὸ μὴδεν ἔχειν ἐλέγχειν ὁμολογία τὸ πλήξας. It was a ſigne he could not confute him, that he ſtruck him; ſo that it be want of arguments, which makes you fall to blowes, and cauſe them to ſuſpect, that if you were not (peradventure for ſome better reaſons then appear to them) diffident of your cauſe, you would give your adverſaries leave to ſpeak as loud as them pleaſed, and not ſeek ſo ſuſpiciouſly to ſtop their mouthes, whilſt they diſpute with you at as much odds, and upon tearmes of as much diſadvantage as Saint *Paul* did with the *Grecian Jewes*, συνεζήτει πρὸς τοὺς ἑλληνιστὰς, οἱ δὲ ἐπεχείρουν αὐτὸν ἀνελεῖν, he diſputed againſt them, but they went about to ſtay him.

Secondly, It deſtroies thoſe plauſible Arguments ſo often uſed of Unity, and Tradition, and Multitude, for, firſt Uniformitie may be induced by power, but Unitie and Impunitie can never be parted; all other agreement being but as a theefe and a robbed perſon agreed, the one to take his purſe, and the other to give it againe. Againe Tradition it lames as much, for how can any man tell, but that two parts claiming contraty Traditions, or one part claiming it upon falſe grounds, and the other denying it, the truth may not by this force have been over-born, when we receive not what men would have delivered Poſteritie, but what Power would ſuffer them.

Againe, how ſhall we know but that the greater part

part of your multitude beleeves not as they profeſſe; no man knowing his Neighbour to be of his mind; when it is ſo probable, that many may not think as they ſpeak, when it is not lawfull for all to ſpeak as they think.

Thirdly, By this way you are cauſes, that you ſuffer often where you have not the State on your ſide, as much as you inflict when you have; for though you will ſay that none ſhould puniſh but the Church, yet every divided companie of Chriſtians, thinking themſelves to be that, (that is to be the orthodox) will uſe your own cuſtome to your harme, and you will be ſhott like the Eagle in *Eſope*, οἰκείοις πτεροῖς with your own feathers; and ſo Truth wereſoever ſhe be (if all follow this way) will by force by many parties be oppoſed, and but by one propagated and defended; ſo that not onely in conſideration of Chriſtianity, but even of Policy I miſlike this courſe, as being alwaies wicked, and often hurtfull, and more often uneffectuall: And for my part, I deſire ſo much that good be done for evill, that (though you be moſt fit of any to be ſo uſed, who uſe us ſo where your power extends, and whoſe cruelty will extend with your acquiſition, if you make any, and you hold your ſelves, that *impendens periculum* is cauſe enough for a warr) yet I heartily wiſh all lawes againſt you repealed, and truſt, that diſarmed Truth would ſerve to expell Falſhood, whereas now they being in force againſt you, give you the honour of a perſecution, and not being executed, give you not the feare of one: It is truely ſaid,

Militia

Militia Christiana est Hæreses expellere, but it needs this limitation, *sed armis Christianis*, that Christian warfare employ onely Christian armes, which are good arguments, and good life; else if they use such a course, as is more properly περὶ τὸ δίκαιον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ πεπειμένον, and go to force that part of man, which is liable to no power but that of perswasion, (which if it do not beget a true and pious assent, in likelyhood it will a damnable dissimulation, and which, if Christ had meant for a prop for his Doctrine, he would as soon have at first made it a part of the foundation, and have charged his Apostles not to shake the dust off their feet, but to draw their swords out of the scabbard at those, who rejected what they taught) then it often (though sometimes by reason of the different dispositions which reigne at severall times among men, and may happen otherwise) misseth of the intended end, and works not often so much as upon mens tongues, and never upon their Heads and Hearts: A great example of which happened not long since, *Calvin* with all his works since the time they were written, having scarce made so many Protestants in *France*, as I have credibly heard it reported, that the Massacre made in a Night, which act though I impute not to all those of your Religion, for many of them I know did, and do mislike it, yet it both had its fountaine from the Popes Legate, (and consequently in all likelyhood from the Pope, who gave God publick thanks for it) as one of his successors confess'd to Cardinall *D' Ossat*, Page 432.

432, and it may be justified as well as any judiciall proceeding, upon that reason which you give, why Heresie may be stopped with the sword, least they who are wrought upon by it, may work upon others.

To conclude, I should be better contented with this course, if the opinions were infallibly errors, and infallibly damnable, and this were alwaies an effectuall way, (and no other could be found more mercifull) to stop their spreading, but since you have no infallible way of knowing the Church to be infallible in her definitions, and consequently, that the contrary opinions are false, since you know not infallibly which is she, (for you pretend but prudentiall Motives) since your knowledge having defined, is likewise fallible, as depending upon many uncertaine circumstances, since not onely the matter of Heresie is thus uncertaine, but the form too: for you confesse you doubt whether *Ignorantia affectata* be it or no, and since though the form were certaine, yet in whom, it is by no meanes plaine, but rather impossible to be known, (as who is obstinate, and consequenly to whom it is damnable) since this course often gives growth, and strength to that, from which it would take even Being and Subsistance: I cannot but think you have cause to change your proceedings, least not onely you expell not, but least you encrease Heresie, and againe least you oppose it not, but mistake the Truth for it, and applaud your self for cutting off a Gangren'd member, when you destroy a sound one, and instead of ending a Hereticke

tick make a Martyr, and againe leaſt (allowing this to be the Truth) yet you put to death innocent perſons inſtead of guilty; eſpecially ſince if the opinions were damnable in whomſoever they were, yet ſome better way might be found, (as cloſe impriſonment or the like) to keep them from harming with them, rather then (as you do by putting them to death, when elſe they might live to be converted) to damne them certainly, leaſt they may poſſibly damne ſome others; Againe for Proteſtants, who joyne with me in beleeving that there is no way to know the true Church, but by true Doctrine, nor to know that but by the Scripture, (for Univerſall Tradition ſeemes to us to deliver nothing but what is ſo plainly contained there, that it is agreed upon) in them I beleeve it muſt be intollerable Pride, and raſhneſſe, (and the ſame in Papiſts concerning thoſe places out of which they would prove the Churches infallibility) To conclude, this ſeemes to me the ſence of this place of Scripture, therefore this infallibility it is, and no man can denie it, who either gainſaies not his Conſcience, or hath it not miſlead by ſome ſinfull paſſion or affection, and therefore the deniers muſt be damned, and therefore leaſt they damne others, we will ſend them through one fire to another. And this, though it be an equall fault in both Proteſtants and Papiſts to ſay and do, yet it is more Illogicall in the former, as contradicting at firſt ſight all their Principles, and deſtroying the whole Platforme upon which the Reformation was built.

He urgeth afterwards againſt the Unity of the Church, that it is none ſuch as we brag of, And I confeſſe we brag of it, and think we have Reaſon. And if it pleaſe him to look into the difference of our Country of England, *and ſome land of* Barbarians, *as* Braſile, *or ſuch other, where they live without Law or Government, I think he will find our bragging is not without ground. For wherein is the difference betwixt a Civill Government and a Barbarous Anarchie? Is it either that in a Civill Eſtate there be no Quarrells, or amongſt* Barbarians *there is no Quiet? The former would prejudice our Courts and Juſtice; the latter is impoſſible even in Nature. What is then the goodneſſe of a government, but in a well Governed Country there is a means to end Quarels, and in Anarchie there can be no aſſured peace? This therefore is it we brag of, that amongſt us if any controverſie ariſe, there is a way to end it, which is not amongſt them who parted from us. And Secondly, That there is no aſſured agreement amongſt thoſe who parted from us, for although to day they agree, there is no bond or tie why to morrow they may not diſagree. Theſe two things we brag of, and I think the Author will not denie it. For he confeſſeth that we all agree, in that the Church is an infallible Miſtreſſe. Then it is evident, that if in any controverſie ſhe interpoſeth her judgment, the controverſie is ended. He likewiſe confeſſeth, that who part from us have no ſuch definitive authority amongſt them, and that Scripture, whereon they rely, hath no ſuch vertue to take up Controverſies clearely.* Reſp.

Suppoſing that we agreed much leſſe then you, yet a little, all in earneſt, that is unforced, is more conſiderable, then much conſtrained, and ſo peradventure much of that much but in appearance; Beſides, that you all agree in thoſe points, wherein if any diſagree, he becomes none of you, is no more then is ſo common to all Religions, that even the very Anabaptiſts may ſay as much for themſelves; For either all the Parts of them remaine of aſſent, inſomuch that they are all ſtill of the ſame Religion, and ſo agree as well as your *Dominicans* and Jeſuites, or elſe their differences are ſuch, as to make them of ſeverall Religions, and then, why is want of Unity objected to them any more then it is to Chriſtians in generall, among whom are ſo many diviſions, and yet not the whole, but the faulty party taxed? And truely in my opinion ſome Queſtions among your ſelves are as great, not onely as any among your adverſaries, but as any between you and them. I but you anſwer, we have a way of being agreed, we reply, is it a way ſure to lead to Truth as well as to Unity, or elſe ſo might we have by going to moſt at three throwes, and reſolving to ſtand to that. Beſides, if you have, and make no more uſe of it, it ſeemes there is no ſuch need that Queſtions be ended, as for that purpoſe to introduce a neceſſitie of an Ender. But ſay you, neither are all ſuits in the Common-wealth ended; We reply, that yet truely thoſe Judges, who ſhould make no more haſte to end them, then your Judge doth theſe, would deſerve to looſe his place, but this they

do

do as faſt as the nature of the thing will permit; which being or depending upon matter of Fact, cannot be known enough to be judged before examination of witneſſes, and the like, be ended, and if they willingly deferre the ending, they are confeſs'd to be in fault by all men, but thoſe who hold Perjury to be none. But you ſeem to conceive our grounds faulty, as not leading even to a poſſible Unity, whereas to a poſſible one I am ſure they do, (ſince what is concluded out of them by many, may be by all) nay indeed am confident, that all who receive the Scripture for the onely rule, and believe what is there plain to be onely neceſſarie, would if they truely beleeved what they profeſſe, and were not lead aſide either by prejudice, or private ends, or ſome Popiſh relicks of holding what they have long been taught, or following the authority of ſome by them much eſteemed, perſons either alive (or dead) ſoon agree in as much as is neceſſarie, and in concluding no neceſſity of agreeing in more, there being no doubt, but it would ſoone appear plainly what is plaine.

Beſides if no grounds be ſufficient for Unitie, which produce not the effect, then it ſeemes, the grounds of your grounds, thoſe Arguments, by which you prove, that there is a Judge, and a generall Councell is it, are inſufficient, ſince they are not able to make all Chriſtians about this queſtion: Again, although a Judge, and this Judge be received, yet this is ſtill an inſufficient ground for Unitie, ſince the *Greek* Church agree thus farre with you (which is as farre as you agree with

one another) and yet are not ſo bound by it to any univerſall Unitie with them, but that they eſteem you Hereticks, and are eſteemed ſo by you: and if you ſay, that it is not, becauſe the grounds, upon which the Infallibilitie of the Church are built, lead not ſufficientlie to Unitie, that we joyne not with you in beleeving them to be infallible, not becauſe the determination of generall Councels is not a ſufficient meanes of Unitie, that the *Greek* Church admitting their authoritie, admits not of your opinions, but it is the fault of us (and of them) hardening our hearts againſt the truth; then we may as well ſay, that ſome of thoſe, who agree in our grounds, yet diſagree from our doctrine, not that the grounds lead not to Unitie, but that our Adverſaries will not be lead; or if (as you doe, and ſome others of you ſometimes) you confeſſe, that they through an innocent error diſſent from you, and doe this without any imputation in this reſpect to your grounds, I hope it will be lawfull for us to allow the ſame poſſibilitie, without any diſadvantage or prejudice to ours: Beſides, ſay you, though we agree to day, yet we may not to morrow, which to prove, were ματὴν τὸ ὕδωρ ἀναλίσκειν, paines whollie loſt, we confeſſe: For though *Tully* make it an expreſſion of his contempt to *Piſo*, in an Epiſtle to *Atticus*, *Ita nihil eſt, ut plane quid erit, neſciat*, yet I take it to be a true ſaying of man in generall, who knowes little of preſent things, and nothing of future; but this is common to us both, for if we change not our opinions, we ſhall agree as we doe, and if you change

change yours you ſhall not, which is poſſible, for not onelie that opinion of the Infallibilitie of your judges decrees may it ſelf be altered, whic holdeth together all the reſt, but ſome of you may holding that ground (like the Greek, either change their opinions concerning the authority of ſuch or ſuch a Councell, as beleeving it unduelie called, factiouſlie carried, or not generall as is pretended, or not ſo conſenting as is requiſite) or differ from the reſt, concerning the ſence of the decrees: for whe eas, you ſay, you agree that the Church is an infallible Miſtreſſe, and when ſhe interpoſeth her judgement, the controverſie is ended.

I anſwer, that, firſt, ſome of you, with whom I have ſpoken my ſelfe, hold, that the Churches authoritie in defining, extends no further then to ſuch points, whereof Tradition is of one part (as in many controverted there is, I beleeve, no ſuch) and that this rule ſhe may tranſgreſſe, and ſo erre.

Secondlie, Neither the *Dominicans* nor their Adverſaries, are very readie to remain in ſuſpence to await her deciſion, but define all readie concerning her definitions, *Cum utraque pars tenax contendat ſuam non aliam poſſe definiri ſententiam*, either part tenaciouſlie urging, that the contrarie opinion cannot be defined, which if they did to fright the Pope from defining, leaſt the condemned partie being even before, ſhould after make a Schiſme, they obtained their end.

Thirdlie, What are you the nearer to Unitie for your Infallible Miſtreſſe the Church, when

you

you neither agree of any certaine and proper markes to know her by, nor when it is that she interposeth her judgement; some take it to be the particular Church of *Rome*, others (of which number you are) all which communicate with her, supposing the first to be true, yet not being *de fide*, it will serve but ill by your rules to build our faith upon, and even when she delivers her opinion is not certainlie agreed, whether the people of *Rome* be to have Votes, or onelie the Clergie, or of them, onelie the Pope with the Cardinals, or the Pope onelie without them, if the Pope, whether onelie in his Chaire, and what circumstances are required to his decreeing in *Cathedra*, would beget more questions: If all that communicate with her (as you say, it is as things now stand.)

First, I would know whether they be sure to be at all times the Church, to that you refuse to determine, and so inclusivelie denie.

Secondlie, It is not possible, that such a multitude should ever give any sentence explicitelie, nor can we ever know, that it hath even tacitelie done so, if they be to decree onelie by representation, then how large a companie represents them with all their power, of whom that companie is to consist, how many of them are to agree to make it a binding sentence, &c. are things yet undefined, and like to be, and if any goe about to determine them, their power being it selfe still a question, could not end these: Therefore, whereas you say, that we have no definitive sentence (be-

(beſides that truly to have one, and not to know when we have one, is much alike;) I anſwer, that whenſoever the Scripture ſhall ſeeme to us to have defined, we are according to our doctrine readie to yeeld, and ſo the controverſie is ended (and ſure the Scripture may be ſaid to be a definitive ſentence, as well as the written Councell of *Trent*) and till then, though we differ about interpretations of not plaine places, we have as much Unitie as you, who are not reſolved upon the ſence of manie decrees of that and other Councels: and if a deſire and diligence to finde the true meaning of them, and an aptneſſe to aſſent when it is found, be thought to ſecure among you, thoſe who miſtake the true ſence of theſe Councels, why ſhould not the ſame diſpoſition in us towards the Scripture, be thought every whit as ſufficient, not onely to keepe us in unitie, but to ſecure us from danger.

To conclude, though unitie be a thing much ſpoken of by you, yet I finde it chieflie onely in your diſcourſe; your differences are many and great, onelie you ſay, you agree in what is neceſſarie, and make the meaſure of things neceſſarie what you agree in, ſo the ſumme is, you agree in what you doe agree (which it is impoſſible you ſhould not, though you had carried away the bayes from *Bibrias* his Tombe) eager againſt us, and yet divided among your ſelves, like the ſtate of an Armie in *Tacitus*, *Manente Legionum auxiliorumque, ubi adverſus Paganos certandum foret, conſenſu*, and if your Church brag of ſuch an Unitie,

Unity, I perceive a ſmall matter will make her brag.

Reſp. *Againe, I do confeſſe moſt* Engliſh-*men confeſſe a Trinity, the Incarnation and Paſſion of our Saviour, but if to morrow, any one or more of them light upon ſome Book of an* Arrian, Trinitarian, *or other Sect, ſo wittily written that he putteth probable ſolutions for the places of Scriptures, ſhewes ſlight waies how our well meaning fore-fathers may have ſlipped into ſuch an Error, what is there to retaine thoſe men from diſagreeing with the reſt of their Bretheren, and betake themſelves to the* Arrians? *And when the heat is paſt light upon ſome Rabbi, who ſhall cunningly exaggerate the abſurdities, (as he ſhall tearm them) of the Trinitie, Incarnation; Say our Saviour did ſtrange things in vertue of ſome Conſtellation, and delivering theſe things ſo Oratorically, that for a new heat, ſome of theſe things ſhall ſeem more conformable then his* Arrianiſme, *what then ſhall hinder this man to become a* Jew, *and at laſt to prove himſelf ſo great a Clerk as to write* de tribus Impoſtoribus: *Take away the power of the Church, which every man doth who taketh away the Infallibility, what can retaine any man why he ſhould not yeeld to that diſcourſe which ſeemeth faireſt, ſeeing nothing is certaine?*

Repl. And if you ſhould meet with a book which ſhould give probable ſolutions to the places of Scripture, and reaſons which you now think prove the authority of the Church, and bring other (though ſuppoſe but ſlight, yet ſuch as may ſeem ſtrong) Arguments to prove it not infallible, and

ſhew

ſhew waies of the ſame kind, how your anceſtors may have ſlipt in that, and by that into other errors, what is there to retaine you with the reſt of your Bretheren, and betaking your ſelfe to us? If you ſay this is impoſſible to be done, ſo think the Proteſtants, that the *Arrians* can give them no probable anſwer to their places of Scripture, and ſuch as will ſeem ſo to ſome, is no imputation to their grounds, ſince ſo may, and do our Anſwers and Objections to ſome of you, who thereupon leave you, and yet you count not your grounds diſparaged. For my part, I profeſſe my ſelf not onely to be an Anti-Trinitarian, but a Turk, whenſoever more reaſon appeares to me for that, then for the Contrary, and ſo ſure would you be too; for the pretended infallibility of your Church could no longer hold you, if you thought you ſaw reaſon to beleeve it fallible, as you muſt do, if all weighed, more reaſon appeared of her adverſaries ſide, either your proofes of her authority not to be probable, or elſe your Doctrines taught by her, more contrary to reaſon, then her authority (though probably founded, yet not upon demonſtrations) is ſufficient to caution, and anſwer for; It is true, ſo long as you ſtick to this hold upon the *Roman* Church, you are ſure to receive no error, but which ſhe offers you, (and indeed you need not, for thoſe are enough) but that deſtroied (which is apter to be deſtroied then moſt of the Proteſtants, as weaklier ſupported by reaſon) then no error that a Proteſtant may fall into, but ſo may you too, and the other is but ſuch a

Priviledge, as I may have by ſticking to the *Engliſh* Church, as well as you to the *Roman*; And though this following your guide, may be able, as long as ſhe keep her ſelf, to keep you from ſome Ditches, into which you might otherwiſe fall, yet it may lead you unto others, and indeed there is no error but by this way you are liable too, yea, even of thoſe which ſhe now condemnes, ſince though ſhe changed her opinion, which is neither impoſſible, nor unlawfull, yet you are by your blind obedience to believe that ſhe had not, and to ſubmit your underſtanding in this Queſtion to ſome diſtinction, though without a difference. Theſe things then I diſlike in what you ſay.

Firſt, Your ſaying, as though there is nothing to retain a Proteſtant from being of any error, when it ſhall appeare more probable to him then Truth, therefore there were nothing to keep him from thoſe errors, whereas you ſhould have conſidered, that the greater probabilities may ſerve reaſonably to hold him without a demonſtration, and the evidence of the thing, without a guide, and that if thoſe be not ground enough for a man to fix upon, in how ill eſtate are thoſe of your Church, in the Queſtion concerning the Church, in which they follow no guide, nor have any demonſtration, but profeſſe they yeeld to her authority, but upon prudentiall motives, which kind of arguments ſure may as well, and as fixedly preſerve a Proteſtant in an Orthodox opinion againſt a Heretick, as the authoritie of the Church no ſurelier founded, can you againſt us: That every man

ſhould

ſhould yeeld to that diſcourſe which ſeemeeth faireſt to him, I confeſſe, it is alwaies, not onelie ſafe and fit, but alſo neceſſarie, even for them who receive the Infallibilitie of the Church, ſince thoſe who beleeve that, beleeve it, becauſe that appeares faireſt to them, and as you object to us, the poſſibilitie of being perſwaded from the truth by ſome wittie Author, why thinke you not the ſame Author may poſſiblie too, appeare to you to deſtroy your prudentiall Motives, and ſo conſequentlie your whole Faith, which is built upon the Church, which is built upon them.

Secondlie, I diſlike your ſeeming to beleeve, that any grounds, which are not demonſtrative, are too ſlipperie to reſt upon, as not onelie being contrarie to reaſon, but to your ſelfe, who told me before, that no more was required, then a maine advantage on one ſide, and that we had reaſon to be ſatisfied with Probabilities to guide our Actions in Religion, or ſince by them we were content to regulate all the other Actions of our life.

Thirdlie, I diſlike in your own parties behalfe your ſaying, that a *Proteſtant* is in good likelihood to turne *Arrian* (for if you meane onelie that it is poſſible, it concernes you as much as them) ſince this ſeemes to inferre, that the Scriptures doe make more probablie for them (which if they did, it is not Hereſie) and to contradict all thoſe, whom both parts call Fathers, who thinke enough plaine in Scripture, not onely to keepe, but alſo to convert men from *Arrianiſme*, as it appeares,

by their employing ſo ſolelie thoſe Armes againſt them, that they needed the admonition of a Heretique, to counſell them to the uſe of another.

Fourthlie, I diſlike your ſaying, that after being made an *Arrian*, he is not unlikelie to turne *Jew*, eſpeciallie, that he is likelie to be perſwaded by any exaggeration of the Abſurdities in the Trinitie, ſince both *Grotius* and other Authors, ſeeme to ſay, that the *Jewes* have their Trinitie too in the ſame Notion, and howſoever the *Arrian* is ſo fullie perſwaded alreadie, that thoſe are abſurdities (that perſwaſion being almoſt the forme of that opinion which conſtitutes him an *Arrian*) yet the exaggeration of them can never worke upon him; And for the Conſtellation you ſpeak of, it were ſo irrationall, and ſo unprovable a Crotchet, that no Oratorie could ever make it ſeeme to a reaſonable man, to have any inclination to ſence (and a foole may be made beleeve any thing, how contrarie ſoever to his grounds) unleſſe he be of thoſe, who are given over to vaine imaginations, becauſe they love darkneſſe better then the light, and the fault of no particular mens underſtanding or will, is to lead any man to condemne his grounds, for they are to be accuſed, not of whatſoever he concludes who holds (or rather in this caſe hath held) them, but onelie of what he concludes reaſonablie according to them. Beſides, for this cauſe it appeares ſtrange to me, that truſting to Scripture alone, and without, meaning the Church, for my certaine guide, ſhould bring a man into danger of parting with his Chriſtianitie, ſince

ſince nothing can hold a man longer then he beleeves it, and as long as our ground, the Scripture, is by him beleeved, no man can poſſiblie turne either *Atheiſt*, or *Jew*; and he who leaves to beleeve your ground, the Church, cannot by that be any more with-held from either: Beſides that, I thinke it is impoſſible (I am ſure it is irrationall) that any of you ſhould beleeve in Chriſt, upon the authoritie of Chriſts Church, ſince beleeving the latter (which claimes no authoritie but from Chriſt) præſuppoſeth the beleife of him, and ſo Chriſtianitie is not the apter to be overthrown through the abſence of that, upon which it is not built: I feare rather, leaſt your doctrine known to be grounded it ſelfe upon Tradition by ſuch a way, according to which, a Jew would have much advantage of a Chriſtian, may incline a man to Judaiſme, and your ſides generall ſlighting all waies of knowing Gods will, but onely by the Church, and then neither proving her power ſtronglier, nor teaching how to know her plainer, may make men ſinke into *Atheiſme*, by being perſwaded by you, in letting goe other ſtrong holds upon Truth, and receiving ſuch weake ones from you. Not to ſpeake of your loading Chriſtianitie with ſuch impoſſibilities as the Pillars of it, which are not abſolute Demonſtrations (of which it may be ſcarce any thing is in nature capable but lines and numbers) are able to beare, and uſing all your Wits and Induſtries to perſwade men, that it is equallie unſafe to refuſe any part of your Religion, as to receive none; and ſo inſtead of making

making theſe your beleefs admitted for the ſake of Chriſtianitie, cauſing Chriſtianitie to be rejected becauſe of them.

Reſp. *But peradventure ſome may attribute Power to the Church without infallibilitie, whom I would have conſider but what himſelf ſaith. For his Church by the Power it hath muſt either ſay I command you to believe, or I command you to profeſſe this, whether you believe me or no. The ſecond, I think no enemy of equivocation will admit, and the former it is as much as if it ſhould ſay, I know not whether I ſay true or no, yet you muſt think I ſay true.*

Repl. We having received a command, that all things be done decently, and in order, and this being to be appointed by them, whom either the Law of the Land, (if that conſiſt of faithfull) or the conſent or cuſtome of Chriſtians hath appointed, for Eccleſiaſticall Rulers in this matter, in every place the Church (thus reſtrained to the Governours of the Church) may have in ſome caſes (though not to your purpoſe) power without the leaſt Infallibilitie. And for inſtruction (which you aime at) no Church can give it, yours eſpecially being too large a body ever to meet or joyn in doing it, and if you reſtraine the Church to the Cleargie, (whereof yet many teach not, and they too are too many for any man to be ſure what they all agree in teaching, and when they differ, how ſhall I know which to follow, otherwiſe then by your Rule which I have anſwered) their duty indeed, but not theirs onely, (though Principally) is to inſtruct us in the way to Heaven, which they doing

doing in the Persons of Embassadors between God and us, and having no absolute Letters of Credence to bid us to beleeve that God saies, whatsoever they say, he saies, (as much as can be wrested out of Scriptures for any present Church, being said of the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, who yet proved themselves not infallible) our best way is in my mind to examine their Commission, and if they can shew that they treat according to that, to submit to them, (as in the same case we must to any of the *Layetie*) or rather to God, of whose commands they are but Organs, and if not, to beware of their Leaven. Yet it may be that some man may hold that such an opinion is to be beleeved onelie, because such a Church proposeth it, and yet not believe her Infallible, since he may think her authoritie (by reason of her Learning, Multitude, Sanctitie, Unitie and Libertie) to be more probable then any contradicting argument, and that men are to assent to what is most probable, and truelie if he could prove to me his *Major*, I am alreadie so much of the opinion of his *Minor*, that I should joyne with him in his Conclusion.

So that if I understand any thing, where there is no Infallibility, there is no Power; where no Power, no Unity; where no Unity, no Entity; where no Entity, no Church. Resp.

How you tie Power to Infallibilitie I guesse, but cannot how you tie Unitie to Power: For how many things are all men even at Unitie about, though one have no Power over another in them, onelie cemented together by their clear evidence: Repl.

And

And how many more do whole Bodies, and Sects of men agree about without any ſuch power, though they differ in other points, as ſo do you too; Do not Proteſtants agree with you about manie, and the chiefeſt *credenda*, and about almoſt all the meerely *facienda*? Though not perſwaded to this agreement by the Power of any Judge which they do acknowledge; Nay if men could be at Unitie about no thing, which were not propoſed by ſome Guide, or defined by ſome Judge endued with ſuch a power, how came all you to agree, that there is ſome ſuch Guide and Judge required, ſince ſure you receive not that upon its own authoritie, and if men may find the neceſſitie of a Guide and Judge, without any Guide or Judge, and remain in Unitie about that, why may they not alſo about whatſoever is clearly taught by God, which reaſon aſſures us to be all that is neceſſarie, and if you ſay that all things neceſſarie are not clearlie taught, becauſe we do not (though it proves not that we might not) agree upon them, then I replie, that I may as well ſay, that neither is it cleare that there is a Guide, becauſe we diſſent from you in it, although receiving the authoritie of the Scripture (out of which Cardinall *Perron* confeſſeth, that Saint *Auſtine* ſaith, that both the neceſſitie of your guide, the Church, and ſhe her ſelf, are to be known) and reaſon, which as they may be plain in this point for you, and yet perſwade us not, ſo may they be in all neceſſarie points, and yet we who make theirs our ground, not perſwade one another.

As

As little ſee I why there can be no Entitie nor Church, where there is no Unitie.

For the firſt, though there be ſmall Unitie among Chriſtians, yet certainly Chriſtians and their Religion have ſome Entitie, indeed if what you ſay were true, there were no Entitie in yours.

For the ſecond, I know not why two parties over-valuing their differences may not conceive each other to be none of the Church, and ſo declare even by excommunications, and yet remain both Parts of it, (for if a Husband miſſe-ſuſpecting his Wife of Adulterie, declare her to be no longer his Wife, this cannot make her give over being ſo, if the bond be indeed not broken) as well as *Chryſoſtome* and *Epiphanius*, both excommunicated by each other, and yet both Saints, or as particular men may by your own confeſſion be interiorly in the Church, although ſeeming out of it, even to the Church her ſelf, and ſo thoſe be both of the Church between whom there is no Unity: For not onely in your own *Cariophilus* his words τὰ πεμπόμενα βέλη ἐκ χειρὸς μὴ ἐχούσης τὸ κῦρος τῆς αὐθεντίας οὐδενὸς ἄξια, but alſo though the perſons have power, yet if the cauſe have not ſufficiencie, I take you to agree, that an excommunication is but a *brutum fulmen*, as Victors of the *Aſian* Biſhops: The beſt therefore and ſtricteſt definition (and which I think you will not refute) which I can give for the Church, is (eſpecially in that ſence, as out of it there can be no ſalvation) thoſe who are deſirous to know Gods Will, (or Chriſts at

the ſtricteſt, for I am not certaine, nor I beleeve is it defined among you, whether an explicite knowledge of Chriſt be abſolutely neceſſarie to Salvation, though I know no guiltleſſe ignorance of him, can bring unavoidably upon any man eternall torments) and ready, when known, to beleeve and follow it; and ſure many of theſe may eternally diſagree even in points which are neceſſarie, abſtracting from particular caſes, and yet their differences not exclude them from the Church, and conſequentlie a Church may be without Unitie, *Quod erat demonſtrandum.*

Reſp. *Now for the Controverſies mentioned, beſides that there is a meanes to terminate them, they be ſuch as bring no breach of the ancient life and action of Chriſtians, which all thoſe opinions do, which for the moſt part are reputed to make Hereticks.*

Repl. You ſaw verie well, that it [no Unitie, no Church] were a true Propoſition, yours hath in it differencies enough to deſtroy its being a Church, and therefore are faine to applie what ſalves you can, but all in vaine: For your meanes to terminate them, doth not make them not to be before they are terminated, and conſequently by your Rule yours is no Church till then. Beſides, their bringing to breach of the ancient life and action of Chriſtians proves not but one of them may be a Hereſie, ſince you ſay not your ſelfe, that all Hereſies are ſuch; but onelie for the moſt part; and indeed to prove that, you muſt be able to ſet down what thoſe opinions are, which before a definition may make a Heretick, which I beleeve you will

will not venture to doe in haſte, though we much deſire it at your hands, that we may know if none of them be ſuch.

That ſome controverſies amongſt us are not reſolved, is a thing neceſſarie amongſt humane affaires, where things muſt have a time to be born, to encreaſe, to fall, and the greater things are, the greater is their Period. Reſp.

It is true, that ſome time to be taken notice of muſt paſſe between an opinions riſing, and being condemned; but that ſo long they ſhould run on, and many of your Councels having ſince been held, is ſure not neceſſarie, and ſhewes, that you eſteem not Unitie ſo neceſſarie as you pretend: ſome opinions I am ſure you can ſoon enough quaſh, as that not long ſince riſen in *Spaine* concerning Fornication being but a Veniall Sin: And whereas you ſay, the greater things are, the greater their period, though this be ture in ſome things, yet not in this, for ſure the greater a difference is, the greater neceſſitie is there that it be ſoon decided, and ſo if your deciſion have power to effect it, as you pretend among you it hath, it muſt fall as ſoon as it is born, like the ζῶα ἐφήμερα, Creatures that live but a day. *Repl.*

Wherefore I do not ſee why this may hurt the Church, more then the ſuits, which hang in our Courts, preiudice the government of the Land. Reſp.

If any of theſe opinions be of that importance, as that though uncondemn'd the Holders are Hereticks, as ſome may be, and my definition being concluded of ſuch among you, ſome of theſe may *Repl.*

may be ſome of them, then ſure they hurt the Church much, and more then the Suites hurt the Government, which their hanging hurts not at all, though it hurts (ſometimes unavoidablie) the Parties. But if where there is no Unitie, there were no Common-wealth, as you ſay, where there is no Uuitie, there can be no Church, then the Government were much prejudic'd by the Suits, as your Church by this rule, is made no Church by the differences; And indeed if men were not agreed about the power of the Governours (as you are not about ſome of your queſtions) it muſt be a maime to the government of any Common-wealth, as conſequentlie theſe are to the goverment of your Church.

Reſp. *The laſt point of the Authors diſcourſe is, to ſhew how errors might have crept in, wherein I ſhall have no oppoſition with him, for I doe not thinke the queſtion is, how they ſhould creep in, but how they ſhould be kept out.*

Repl. Here Sir, I cannot but beleeve, that you intended to refreſh your ſelfe with ſome Mirth, as with Muſicke between the Acts; for though both our ends be, that errors ſhould not creep in, yet the queſtion was, whether it were poſſible that they might creepe in, and to my affirmative part it conduced to ſhew thoſe waies, by which either they have entred, or eaſilie might doe ſo, this ſhewing how they may ſteale in, teacheth how to keep them out, as it is an aide to the ſaving of a Town, to diſcover the breaches, which cannot be guarded without they be firſt known.

For

For the Fluxibility of humane Nature is so great, that it is no wonder if errors should have crept in, the wayes being so many; but it is a great wonder of God that none should have crept in. This nevertheleſſe I may say, if the Author will confeſſe, as I thinke he will not deny, but that it is diſputable, whether any error in ſixteen Ages hath crept in, this very thing is above Nature. For if there were not an excellency beyond the nature of corruptible things, it would be undeniably evident, that not one or two, but thouſands of errors had quite changed the ſhape of the Church in ſo many yeares, tempeſts, diſ-unions, want of Commerce in the body of the Church. Resp.

The greater wonder it were, if your Church had no error, the greater it is to me, that upon one, at moſt but probable, Reaſon, you ſhould require all men to beleeve ſhe hath none; Neither doth it appeare to me diſputable, whether ſhe have or no, but evident, that ſhe hath, not by Demonſtrations, yet by Probabilities of that multitude, and weight upon which you ſay (and ſay trulie) that in all other caſes we relie, and venture that we moſt eſteem: whereas indeed you, as you are of the impoſing Partie, ought to bring at leaſt ſuch proofes, that you are fallen into none, and as you are of the Infallibilitie-pretending-partie, your proofes are likewiſe to riſe from probable to Infallible: Neither doe I conceive it to be probablie argued, it is diſputable, whether this bodie of men have ever let in any error, therefore it can never let in any, ſince it is at leaſt as diſputable, whether the *Grecians* have let in any, yet you will not allow, that Repl.

that upon this we ſhould adjudge to her Infallibilitie: Nay if it were demonſtrative, that your Church had yet never erred, yet it would but unwillinglie follow, that ſhe never could, ſince all things neceſſarie are ſo plaine (without the confeſſion of which you ſeeme to tax God) and it is naturallie ſo plaine what is plaine, that I cannot but thinke it a miracle, that ſome one bodie of Chriſtians among ſo many, ſhould be free from any ſuch dogmaticallie-defended error, eſpeciallie if Truth were ſo indifferentlie ſought after as it ought to be, and Paſſion were not often called to counſell, and Reaſon ſhut out of doores.

Reſp. *But this one Maxime, that ſhe receiveth her Faith by Tradition, and not from Doctors hath ever kept her entire: And he that will ſhew the contrary, muſt ſhew how it ſhould come to paſſe, that thoſe, who lived in ſuch an Age, would ſay unto our Children, this we received from our fore-fathers, as taught them by our fore-fathers, to have been received from Chriſt and his Apoſtles from hand to hand, which if it could not be, the queſtion is reſolved, that no error is in the Church of God, which holdeth her faith upon that Tenure.*

Repl. Not to repeat, *uſque ad nauſeam*, what I have heretofore anſwered, as that others differing from you, hold upon the ſame Tenure that your ſelves have not alwaies held, nor hold not upon it, &c. I will onelie tell you what Cardinall *Perron* tels me of the *Jewes* out of *Iſidore*, and that is, that they ſeeing in the book of *Wiſedome* ſo cleare proofes of Chriſt, plotted togeather to put it out of the Canon,

Canon, which ſerves not ſo much his turne, if it were ſo, as it makes againſt yours, and ſhews how that might come to paſſe, which you judge impoſſible, the Poſteritie of the *Jewes* having been deceived by this Complot; although pretending at leaſt, and for ought appeares, beleeving that the Tradition of their Church is ſtill uncorrupted.

Reſp. *And truely if the Author deſires to examine divers Religions, let him look their maine ground wherein they relie, and ſee whether that be Good or no: And I think amongſt Chriſtians he ſhall find but two, Tradition, and Scripture.*

Repl. Firſt, I allow not of your diviſion, for not to ſay now that you relie not onely upon Tradition, theſe Proteſtants, whoſe part in this I take, depend not onelie upon Scripture, but upon Univerſall Tradition too, from which they receive that, and would more, if more ſeemed as clearly to them ſo to be delivered.

Secondly, I think it reaſonable not onely to examine what their Principles are, but whether they do conſtantly follow them, for a man may write awrie, that hath a ſtreight Ruler, if he obſerve it not carefully.

Reſp. *And the Catholiques onely to relie upon Tradition, and all the reſt upon Scripture; and he ſhall ſee, that relying upon Scripture cannot draw to an Unitie thoſe who relie upon it, and more then one cannot relie upon Tradition.*

Repl. If all that relie upon Tradition be Catholicks, you muſt admit the Eaſtern Churches into your Com-

Communion, although you now account them both Schismaticks and Hereticks: If all Catholicks do relie upon Tradition as their onelie grounds, and Tradition be so sure and infallible, and unmistakable a deliverer, as you would perswade us, how come so manie differences between you, some ever counting those things matter of Faith which others do not; which differences shew, if they all relie on these Questions, upon the ground you say they do, that more then one may relie upon Tradition, and neither can Tradition, any more then Scripture, draw to an Unitie, those who relie upon it; if either neither part do, or either do not, then Tradition is not the Common Tenure of Catholicks, (not onelie in different opinions, but even in such as are most *dè fide*, and as both parts think nothing but a definition (and some scarce that) to make the Holders of the contrary to them Hereticks) since if it were, neither could one part of Catholicks relie upon any other then the Catholick ground, neither is it to be doubted, but that side which builds their opinion upon an Hereticall foundation against another, beleeved upon a Catholick ground, would long agone have been among you exploded, and the Pope have been not onelie with so much paines perswaded, but even of himselfe readie to have past his censure upon them; if not for their superstructions, yet for their foundation.

Resp. *If I will be a Christian, I must be of one side.*

Repl. If you mean I must be of one side, that is take one of these grounds, I answer, That I take both one

one from the other, Scripture from Tradition, though not from the preſent Tradition of a Part, but from the Univerſall one of the firſt Chriſtians oppoſed by none, but by them, who were inſtantlie counted by the generallitie heterodox, and as ſoon oppoſed as known. If you mean that I muſt be of one ſide in points, I whollie denie any ſuch neceſſitie.

Reſp. *By falling on the one ſide, I ſee my fortune in thouſands who have gone before me, to wit, that I ſhall be to ſeek all my life time, as I ſee they are, and how greatlie they magnifie verie weak pieces. On the other ſide, I ſee everie man who followeth, as farr as he followeth it, is at quiet.*

Repl. I ſee not but the greateſt part of thoſe who take the ground which you miſlike, are yet ſetled and confident enough in their opinion, and if they continued alwaies ſeeking Truth for the love of it, I know not why they ſhould be the leſſe likely to find Heaven: Neither think I that you will ſay (nay it is plaine by your own words, that you will not ſay) that Saint *Auſtine* had been damned if he had died in his ſearch, nor conſequently any other in his caſe. And whereas you ſay, that all who follow the other, are at quiet as farr as they follow it, I anſwer, So are all who fixedly beleeve themſelves to follow an infallible (although indeed a falſe) Guide, as the *Mahumetans*, being led by their *Mufty*, : Which proves Quiet, no ſufficient caution for Truth, nor Securitie for Safetie, and that, ſuppoſing yours the more eaſie and ſatisfying way, it followes not that it is the more reaſon-

able: And for what you ſay of a mans duty to judge himſelf rigorouſly, whether he ſeek as he ought, I ſubſcribe to that opinion, and approve of your Councell.

Reſp. *Beſides this, he muſt have this care, that he ſeek what the Nature of the ſubject can yeeld, and not as theſe Phyſitians, who when they have promiſed no leſſe then immortality, can at laſt onely reach to ſome conſervation of health, or youth in ſome ſmall degree; So I could wiſh the Author well to aſſure himſelf, Firſt, that there is poßible an infallibilitie, before he be to carneſt to be contented with nothing leſſe. For, what if humane nature ſhould not be capable of ſo great a good, would he therefore think fitting to live without any Religion, becauſe he could not get ſuch a one as himſelf deſired, though with more then a mans wiſh.*

Repl. What you now ſay, I confeſſe is very rationall, (as indeed all you ſay, is as much as your cauſe will ſuffer) and I require you not therefore to prove your opinions to be infallible by infallible arguments, as neceſſarie to be done in it ſelf, but as neceſſarie to be done by them, of whoſe opinions their Churches infallibilitie is not onelie a part, but a ground, and that the chief, if not the onelie one, and of which an infallible certaintie is the firſt and main condition of their Communion, and our want of it, one of their maine Objections againſt us.

Reſp. *He that will make a judgement in an Art he is not Maſter in, if he be deceived, it is to be imputed to himſelf. The Phraſe commandeth us to believe eve-*

ry

ry man in his Art, he who knoweth and underſtandeth himſelfe beleeveth not. Therefore when wee ſee Maſters in an Art, we are not skild in, oppoſe us, we may beleeve we are in the wrong, which will breed this Reſolution in the Author of the diſcourſe, that if himſelf be not skild in all thoſe waies in which he purſues his ſearch, he muſt find himſelf obleiged to ſeek Maſters, who be both well skilled, and the matter being ſubject to faction alſo, very honeſt, and upright men, or elſe he doth not quitt himſelf before God.

Truelie I am farr from being Maſter either in this or any other Art, but if for this cauſe I ought to doubt, and becauſe much learneder perſons oppoſe me, I ought to beleeve my ſelf in the wrong, then ſo ought thoſe of your part to do; who are as Ignorant as I, we having many much more learned then they who oppoſe them, and take our part, though therefore I think not of my ſelf (what *Tully* in a Complement would perſwade one of his Friends, that *Nemo eſt qui ſapientiùs mihi poſsit ſuadere meipſo*, yet I dare not chuſe (as you would have me) ſome Maſter to ſearch for me, and beleeve him blind-fold, (though if I would, I ſee no cauſe why to chuſe any from among you, who have ſo many able Teachers at home(for you confeſſing that the matters are ſubject to Faction, and it being certaine, that not onelie who are honeſt is impoſſible to be known, but that eagerneſſe and deſire to have, what they think Truth, prevaile, makes even the honeſt men ſometimes deviate from the line of exact honeſtie, *Repl.*

and lie for God, which he not onelie needs not, but forbids, (as is to be ſeen too frequentlie in the Quotations of both ſides) I conceive it the beſt way to follow my own Reaſon, ſince I know I have no will to cozen my ſelf, as they may have to cozen me: Eſpecially ſince neither could I build upon ſuch a way, an aſſent of ſuch a degree, as your Church requires, ſince ſuch Maſters, although learned, which I being unlearned may be deceived in, and honeſt, which all men might be deceived in, yet not infallible, could not in reaſon make me infallibly certaine of the Orthodoxneſſe of that ſide, which they ſhould chuſe for me: So that what was ſaid by the *Pagan Solomon Socrates*, (who yet was no confident man of his knowledge) ἐγὼ διὰ τοῦτ' ὅτι μηδένα πείθεσθαι ἢ τὸν λογὸν, ὅστις ἐμοὶ λογιζωμένῳ ϛελτίων φαίνεται, is my reſolution too, and indeed in effect if not whollie, yet almoſt every mans, for thoſe who truſt their Reaſon leaſt, yet truſt it in this, that ſome other inſtead of it is to be truſted, and ſo chuſe who they are to truſt, againſt which the Arguments either from the fallibilitie of Reaſon in generall, or in this particular remaine equally, an ignorant man being as likely to be deceived in the choice of his Guide, as in that of his Way, and that courſe being rather the ſhorter then the better, as venturing in the ſame, and no ſtronger a Bark, onelie venturing all his wealth at once.

Reſp. *It is not all one not to incurre damnation for infidelitie, and to be in ſtate of damnation; for the man to whom infidelitie is not imputed, may be in ſtate*

ſtate of damnation for other faults; as thoſe were, who having known God by his works, did not glorifie him as they ought.

That men may be damned for other faults concernes not our Queſtion, nor indeed is any. *Repl.*

Nay, they may be damned for want of Faith, and yet not be damned for incredulitie, As for example ſake, if when they have ſinned, they know not what meanes to have them forgiven, though they be without fault in not beleeving, nevertheleſſe dying without Remiſſion of ſin, they are not in ſtate to come to life everlaſting. Reſp.

This concernes no Chriſtians, none of which that I know differs from you in the neceſſarie meanes of obtaining forgiveneſſe for ſinnes, for though you require Confeſſion, yet you allow that Contrition will ſave without it: Neither do I believe; but an imperfect Repentance cauſed through faultleſſe Ignorance, of what it is for it to be perfect, will ſtill be accepted by him who reguards the Heart more then the Action, indeed onelie the Action, becauſe of the Heart; and knowes, that if he uſe not the appointed meanes, it is onelie becauſe he knowes it not, elſe conſidering the manie impoſitions from above the great frailtie within; and the great and manie temptations without; ſo that to fall into no ſin, were morally impoſſible; he who [illegible], generally obſerved what he counted himſelf bound to obſerve, if for ſome faults which he was after heartilie ſorry for, and had ſincerelie reformed, he ſhould be damned for want of knowing more, how *Repl.*

how to purge himself from them then he could possiblie know, God would not be desirous of the Salvation of all men, and it would seem agreeable to no Mercy, nor to any Justice, except that *Summum jus*, which ever hath been thought condemnable in man, and consequentlie incompatible in God.

Resp. *As the man who should venture into a wood without a Guide, although he did his best to have a guide, nothing lesse might fall out of his way as well as he who neglected the taking of one; so if God sent us his Son to shew us the way of Salvation, as well is he like not to be saved who never heard of such a way, as he that heard of it and neglected it, for neither of the two goeth that way: And who goeth not on the way, is not like to come to the end.*

Repl. The way is beleeving and obeying Christ, for them to whom He and his Commands are sufficientlie propoſed, I mean so, that it is their fault if they know them not: In generall then, it is seeking the Truth impartially, and obeying diligently what is found sincerely, and who treads this way, though he misse of Truth, shall not misse of his favour who is the Father of it, and if he be excluded Heaven, sure God meant that he should never come thither, and desires not that he and all else should, else he would not have proposed onelie such a way, which if it were possible for any to misse without his own fault, and which he knew that many would. Truely, that no opinion, that no error is a sin without the cause of it be one; and that God is not displeased with any man for not seeing

ſeeing what it is not his fault that he doth not ſee, is agreeable to the common Notions of Juſtice, and God, and it is a verie good Negative way to trie ſuperſtructions by, to ſee whether they agree with theſe grounds of all Religion, whereof, rather then beleeve ſuch men ſhould be damned, I would beleeve they ſhould be annihilated, or keep your Children companie, and have *pœnam damni*, though not *ſenſus*.

Reſp. *I know God is good and mercifull : But I know his decrees as farr as we know are diſpenced by the order of ſecond Cauſes, and where we ſee no ſecond Cauſes, we cannot preſume of the effects; and how am I aſſured he will ſend Angels to illuminate ſuch men as do their endeavonrs, that their Soules may not periſh.*

Repl. A carefull ſearch of Gods, and incluſively Chriſts will, and readineſſe to obey it, is ſecond Cauſe enough; For, for want of that ſecond cauſe, we muſt not ſuppoſe any thing to the diſhonour of of the Firſt. As to beleeve, that they ſhould be ſo puniſht who do their endeavours, is to lay their damnation to Gods charge : One of the chiefe waies with which the Ancients oppoſed the *Pagans*, was ſhewing them that their Religion taught ſuch things of their Gods, as no Reaſon would allow not to be diſhonourable to the Diety. Now truely, if when by this Argument we have rooted out the *Pagan* Gods, we lay as ſtrange imputations upon the God of the Chriſtians, what effect is it likely to produce, but onely to make men call for their old Gods againe, and think that we had as good kept thoſe, who delighted in the Sacrifices of men, who

who depoſed their Fathers, and eat their Children, as have changed hardly for the better. It is reported in the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory that a Painter for drawing Chriſt in the likeneſſe of *Jupiter*, had his hand dried up, and certainlie they who figure him to themſelves, and others with Attributes ſo contrary to his, and more fit for a *Jupiter*, do him much more wrong, then if they had drawn him *Tela triſulca tenentem*, with a thunder bolt in his hand. What Maſter, Father, or King, would not be eſteemed a Tyrant, who ſhould inflict not onelie an infinite, and an eternall, but a ſlight and a ſhort puniſhment upon a Servant, Child, or Subject, for not doing when commanded, what the Commanders ſaw with all his endeavours, which he had diligently applied, he could not do; and ſhall we lay ſuch an aſperſion upon that God, (who though he be Juſtice it ſelf, is more Mercifull then Juſt, who is Πατὴρ οἰκτιρμῶν, the Father of Mercies) as that like a *Pharaoh*, he ſhould exact Brick, when there is no poſſibilitie of getting Straw. You may beleeve what you think fit, but rather then I will beleeve that any mans Soule that hath done his endeavours, not onelie ſhall, but that it is poſſible it ſhould periſh, (although not illuminated by Angels, which yet, if Illumination were neceſſarie, I know ſome way or other he ſhould have) rather then I will beleeve, either that any be damned for what is no ſin, or that ſin is τὶ ἀφ' ἡμῶν, ſomewhat out of our power, (which if we thought, it would be ſoon out of our care) rather then when God hath ſo often told us, *That he*

he desires not the death of a sinner, I will give him the lie, and say, that he desires his damnation, even as a Creature without any reference to his sin, by chalking out onelie such a way from Hell, which it was impossible for his search to lead him into, and so make him as much a worse Father then Satan, as to damne is worse then to devoure; rather I say then this, I will make yours, or the *Pagan Legend*, *Ovids Metamorphosis*, my Creed; nor would I be a member of the Christian Church, if this beliefe were a necessarie part of Christian Religion, but should crie out with *Averroes*, (whom Transubstantiation kept a *Pagan*) *Sit anima mea cum Philosophis*, for the excellencie, and puritie of the doctrine in all other points tending wholly to the honour of God, and the common happinesse of man, the sanctified life, constant sufferings, and wonderfull Miracles of the Divulgers of it, the wonderfull progress of it, (not a much lesse Miracle then they) the weak things of the World confounding the strong, and Fishermen confuting Philosothers, that a Doctrine so strict and contrarie to humane desires, and not onelie barring from so much pleasure and glory, but also makeing the Sectators liable to such crueltie and contempt, should perswade so manie, and so wise persons to leave present things in hope of future, all this and whatsoever else, any *Raimond*, *Sebaud*, *Vives*, *Plesiis*, *Charron*, or *Grotius*, could either more sharply designe, or more eloquentlie expresse, would not reasonablie prevaile, if such a block as such a Doctrine were laid in the way, (of which

ſort your Religion hath yet more) and that one dead flie would corrupt the whole ointment; the excellencie of the reſt of the Doctrine of Chriſtianitie would be thought the Art, and the great and and manie miracles would be thought the Act of ſome evill *Genius*, ſuch as befriended *Apollonius*, to enſnare men by thoſe meanes into the beleef of that opinion, which ſo much derogates from the Maker of things, and the prevailing of it, though a very probable argument, would not ſerve for a Paſſe-Port to ſuch an impoſſibilitie.

Reſp. *But farr more do I doubt, whether ever man, who had not the way of Chriſt, or even of thoſe who walked in it, did ever do his beſt (except ſome few, and very few, perhaps not two of Chriſt his greateſt Favourites) and was not ſo culpable, that his Perdition would not have been imputed unto himſelf. God of his mercie put us in the ſcore of thoſe of whom he ſaith,* He will take pittie upon whom he pleaſeth, and Compaſſion of them he pittieth.

Repl. How few their number is we will not diſpute, ſince Gods juſtice is in them vindicated, and they, not He, the Author of their damnation. But neither beleeve I, that God is ſo rigorouſly juſt, as to ſtand readie to catch at a ſlip, (like an Uſurer for the forfeiture of a bond) but is of long ſuffering and Patience, and will as well accept our Repentance, (joyned with amendment for this neglect in our ſearch, as for other ſinns: Howſoever I am ſo farre from thinking your prayer needleſſe, that I both thank you for it humbly, and joyne with you in it heartilie; but ἄλλο δρυὸς

To

To conclude, I am to make two very contrary excuſes; The one that my Paper hath left ſome things in yours unanſwered: The other, that I have anſwered others too often.

Of the firſt, I proteſt (which the Reader will beleeve me in) nothing is left out, in which I conceived any weight of Argument lay, but onelie ſuch things, as though they were ſuperfluous for the Logick, yet conduced to the Rhetorick of your work, an eloquent Treatiſe, being alwaies like a hopefull young Man, *in quo aliquid amputandum.*

Of the Second, My Method, or rather my no Method was one, and your own Repetitions another Reaſon, ſo that you may the better pardon me that fault, of which your ſelf are a partie-cauſe.

But to ſeale up all, I deſire you, that how little aſſent ſoever you give to my Arguments, you will be pleaſed to give credit to my Aſſertions, when I ſeriouſly profeſſe my ſelfe,

Your very much obliged and thankfull Servant.

Mr. *Walter Montague* his Letter to the Lord of *Faulkland*.

My Lord,

AFter much debate concerning the fitteſt expreſsion of my duty to your Lordſhip, whether I ought by ſilence, ſeek to ſuſpend your beleife of the declaration of my ſelfe, I have made here, or by a clear profeſsion of it, aſſure you of what I may onely feare to preſent you with, as apprehenſive of a miſ-interpreted affection; I conclude, what was moſt ſatisfactory to my firſt, and immediate duty to God, was moſt juſtifiable to my ſecond, and derivative to Nature. Therefore I reſolved ſo ſoone, to give you this ingenious accompt of my ſelfe: The greateſt part of my life capable of diſtinction of Religions, hath been imployed in places, and converſant with perſons, oppoſite to the Faith I was bred in, therefore it had been ſtrange, if Naturall curioſity, without any ſpirituall provocation, had not invited to the deſire of looking with mine own eyes upon the foundation I ſtood upon, rather there holding faſt blindfold by my education, to agree to be carried away alwayes after it, inſenſible of all ſhocks I met to unfaſten me, and beſides, I was ſolicited with the reproaches Proteſtants

teſtants preſſe upon Catholicks, that they blindly beleeve all the Impoſtures of the Church, without any illumination of the Judgements, this my thoughts injoyned, the cleareſt information of my ſelfe of the differences between us I could propoſe to my capacity.

So at my laſt journey into Italy, *I did imploy all my leaſure to a more juſtifiable ſettlement of my beleife, as I then imagined, by a confirmation of my judgement, in what had been introduced by my birth and education. I began with this conſideration, that there were two ſorts of queſtions between the Catholicks and Proteſtants, the one of Right or Doctrine, the other of Fact or Story; As this, whether* Luther *were the firſt Erecter of the Proteſtants Faith, whether it had a viſible appearance of Paſtors and Teachers before his time, I reſolved to begin my enquiry with the Queſtion of Fact, for theſe Reaſons.*

Firſt, Becauſe they were ſo few, and ſo comprehenſible by all capacities, and the controverſies of doctrine ſo intricate, and ſo many, as they required much time and learning for their diſquiſition, onely I found my ſelfe unprovided for both theſe requiſitions for this undertaking, and for the deciſion of the other, I needed not much preſumption to beleeve my ſelfe a competent Judge, when it conſiſteth onely in the peruſall of authentique Teſtimonies.

Secondly, I conſidered, that there was no one point of controverted doctrine whereon all the reſt depended, but that this one Queſtion of Fact was ſuch, as the diciſion of it determined all the reſt, for if

Luther

Luther *could be proved to be the Innovatour of the Proteſtants faith, it was neceſſary evicted, of not being the true ancient Apoſtolicall Religion. Therefore I began with this enquiry, which Proteſtants are bound to make to anſwer to this Objection, to find out an exiſtence of ſome Profeſſors of the reformed Doctrines before* Luthers *time: for finding the Catholicks were not obliged to prove the Negative, it was my part, to prove to my ſelfe the Affirmative, that our Religion was no innovation by ſome pre-exiſtence before that, but in the peruſall of all the Stories or Records, Eccleſiaſticall, or Civill, as I could chooſe, I could finde no ancienter a diſſention from the* Roman *Church then* Waldo, Wickliffe, *or* Huſſe, *whoſe cauſe had relation to the now-profeſſed Proteſtancy, ſo as I found an intervall of about eight hundred yeares from the time, that all the Proteſtants confeſſe a Unity with the Church of* Rome *down to thoſe perſons, without any apparent profeſſion of different Faith. To anſwer my ſelfe in this point, I read many of our Proteſtant Authors who treated of it, and I found moſt of them reply to this ſence, in which I cite here one of the moſt authentique,* Doctor Whitaker *in his Controverſie 2. 3. pag. 479. where they aske of us, where our Church was heretofore for ſo many Ages? We anſwer, that it was in ſecret ſolitude, that is to ſay, it was concealed, and lay hid from the ſight of men, and further, the ſame Doctor,* Chap. 4. *pag. 502. our Church alwayes was; but you ſay it was not viſible, doth that prove that it was not? No, for it lay hid in a ſolitary concealment; to this direct ſence, were all the anſwers*

that

that ever I could meet to this Objection; I repeat no more, theſe places being ſo poſitive to our point. This confeſſion of Inviſibilitie in our Church for ſo many ages did much perplex me, it ſeemed to me, even to offend Naturall reaſon, ſuch a derogation from Gods power or providence, as the ſufferance of ſo great an Eccliplſe of the light of this true Church, and ſuch a Church as this is deſcribed to be, ſeeming to me repugnant to the maine reaſon, why God hath a Church on Earth, which is to be conſerver of the Doctrine, Chriſts precepts, and to conveigh it from age to age, untill the end of the world. Therefore I applyed my ſtudy, to peruſe ſuch arguments as the Catholicks brought for the proofe of a continuall viſibility of the true Church down from the Apoſtles time in all Ages, and apparance of Doctors teaching and adminiſtring the Sacrament, in proofe of this I found they brought many proviſoes of the Scripture, but this text moſt literall, of the fourth of the Epheſians, Chriſt hath placed in his Church, Paſtors and Doctors, to the conſummation of the Saints, till we meet in the Unity of the Faith, *and next the diſcourſe, upon which they inferre this neceſſary viſible ſucceſſion of the Church, ſeemed to me, to be a moſt rationall and convincing one, which is to this effect, Naturall Reaſon not being able to proportion to a man a cauſe that might certainly bring him to a ſtate of ſupernaturall happineſſe, and that ſuch a cauſe being neceſſary to mankinde, which o herwiſe would totally faile of the end it was created for, there remained no other way, but that it muſt be propoſed unto us by one, whoſe authority we could not doubt*

doubt of, and that in ſo plaine a manner, as the ſimpleſt may be capable of it as well as the learned. This work was performed by our Saviour, from whoſe mouth all our Faith is originally derived, but this ſucceeding age not being able to receive it immediate from thence, it was neceſſary it ſhould be conveyed unto them that lived in it, by theſe that did receive it from Chriſts own Mouth, and ſo from Age to Age vntill the end of the world; and in what Age ſoever this thred of doctrine ſhould be broken, it muſt needs be acknowledged for the reaſon above mentioned, that the light, which ſhould convey mankind through the darkneſſe of this world, was extinguiſhed, and mankind is left without a Guide to infallible ruine, which cannot ſtand with Gods providence and goodneſſe, which Saint Auſtine *affirmes for his opinion, directly in his book* de Util. Cred. Cap. 16. *ſaying,* If divine providence doe preſide over humane affaires, it is not to be doubted, but that there is ſome authoritie conſtituted by the ſame God, upon which going, as upon certaine ſteps, we are carried to God; *nor can it be ſaid, he meant the Scriptures onely by theſe ſteps, ſince experience ſhewes us the continuall alteration about the right ſence of ſeverall of the moſt important places of it, that what is contained there, cannot be a competent rule to mankind, which conſiſteth more of ſimple then learned men; and beſides, the Scriptures muſt have been ſuppoſed to have been kept in ſome hands, whoſe authority muſt beget our acceptance of it, which being no other thing then the Church in all Ages, we have no more reaſon*

to beleeve, that it hath preſerved the Scriptures free from all corruption, then that it hath maintained it ſelfe in a continuall viſibility, which Saint Auguſtine *concludeth to be a marke of the true Church, in theſe words, in his book* Cont. Cecill. 104. The true Church hath this certaine ſigne, that it cannot be hid, *therefore it muſt be known to all Nations; but that part of the Proteſtants is unknown to many, therefore cannot be the true; no inference can be ſtronger then from hence, that the concealement of a Church diſproves the truth of it. Laſtly, not to inſiſt upon the allegation of the ſence of all the Fathers of the Church in every ſeverall Age, which ſeemed to me moſt cleare; that which in this cauſe weighed much with me, was the confeſſion and teſtimony of the approved Doctors themſelves of the Proteſtant Church, as* Hooker *in his Book of* Eccleſ. Pol. *pag.* 126. God alwaies had, and muſt have ſome viſible Church upon Earth: *and Doctor* Field, *the firſt of* Eccleſ. cap. 10. It cannot be, but thoſe that are the true Church muſt be known by the profeſſion of truth; *and further, the ſame Doctor ſayes*, How ſhould the Church be in the world, and nobody profeſſe openly the ſaving truth of God; *and Doctor* White *in his defence of the Way*, chap. 4. pag. 790. The providence of God hath left Monuments and Stories for the confirmation of our faith; *and I confeſſe truly, that our Religion is falſe, if a continuall deſcent of it cannot be demonſtrated by theſe monuments down from Chriſts time; this appeareth unto me a direct ſubmiſſion*

miſsion of themſelves, to produce theſe apparent teſtimonies of the publique profeſsion of their faith, as the Catholiques demand; but this I could never read, nor know of any that performed; for Doctor White *himſelfe, for want of proofe of this, is faine to ſay in another place in his Way to the Church, pag.* 510. The Doctors of our faith, hath had a continuall ſucceſſion, though not viſible to the world, *ſo that he flies from his undertaking of a conſpicuous demonſtration of the monuments of his faith, to an inviſible ſubterfuge, or a beleife without apparance; for he ſaith, in the ſame book in another place, pag.* 84. All the eternall government of the Church may faile, ſo as a locall and perſonall ſucceſſion of Paſtors may be interrupted; *and pag.* 403. We doe not conteſt for an externall ſucceſſion, it ſufficeth that they ſucceed in the doctrine of the Apoſtles and Faithfull, which in all ages did imbrace the ſame Faith; *ſo as here he removeth abſolutely all externall proofe of ſucceſsion, which before he conſented to be guided by. I cannot ſay, I have verbally cited theſe Authors, becauſe I have tranſlated theſe places, though the Originall be in Engliſh, yet I am ſure, their ſence is no way injured; and I have choſen to alledge Doctor* Whites *authority, becauſe he is an Orthodox Profeſſor of the Proteſtant Church; the reflection of the ſtate of this queſtion, where I found the Proteſtants defend themſelves, onely by flying out of ſight, by confeſsing a long inviſibility in their Church in apparance of Paſtors and Doctors; the ſame interpretation left me much looſened from the*

faſtneſſe of my profeſſed Religion, but had not yet tranſported me to the Catholique Church, for I had an opinion, that our Divines might yet fill up this vacancy with ſome more ſubſtantiall then I could meet with, ſo I came back into England, *with a purpoſe of ſeeking nothing ſo intentively as this ſatisfaction, and to this purpoſe I did covertly (under another mans name) ſend this my ſcruple to one, whoſe learning and ſufficiency I had much affiance in, in theſe termes, whether there was no viſible ſucceſſion to be proved in the Proteſtant Church, ſince the Apoſtles time down to* Luther, *and what was to be anſwered to that Objection, beſides the Confeſſion of inviſibility for ſo many ages, to this I could get no other anſwer, but that the point had been largely and learnedly handled by Doctor* White, *and many other of our Church: upon this I reſolved to informe my ſelfe in ſome other points, which ſeemed to me unwarrantable and ſuſpitious in the Ceremonies of the* Romane *Church, ſince I had ſuch an inducement as ſo little ſatisfaction in a point that ſeemed to me ſo eſſentiall; and in all theſe ſcruples, I found mine own miſtake in the beleife of the Tenents of the* Romane *Church, gave me the onely occaſion of ſcandall, not the practiſe of their doctrines, and to confirme me in the ſatisfaction of all them, I found the practiſe and authority of moſt of the ancient Fathers, and in the Proteſtant refutations of theſe doctrines, the recuſations of their authorities, as men that might erre, ſo that the queſtion ſeemed then to me, whether I would rather hazard the erring with them, then*

with

with the latter Reformers, which consequently might erre also in dissenting from them: I will not undertake to dispute the severall Tenents controverted, nor doubt that your Lordship will suspect, that I omitted any satisfaction in any of them, since my resolution, of reconciling my selfe to the Romane *Church, is not liable to any suspition of too forward or precipitate resignation of my selfe, my judgement perchance may be censured of seducement, my affection cannot be of corruption.*

Upon these reasons I did, soone after my returne last into England, *reconcile my selfe to the* Romane *Catholique Church, in the beleife and convincement of it, to be the true ancient and Apostolicall by her externall markes, and her internall objects of faith and doctrine; and in her I resolve to live and dye, as the best way to Salvation: When I was in* England *I did not study dissimulation so dexterously, as if my fortune had read it to me, nor doe I now professe it so desperately, as if it were my fortunes Legacie, for I doe not beleeve it so dangerous, but it may recover, for I know the Kings wisedome is rightly informed, that the Catholique Faith doth not tend to the alienation of the Subject, it rather super-infuseth a Reverence and Obedience to Monarchie, and strengthens the bands of our obedience to our Naturall Prince, and his Grace and Goodnesse shall never finde other occasion of divertion of them from the naturall usuall exercise of themselves, upon those that have the honour to have beene bred with approbation of fidelity in his*

his ſervice, nor can I feare, that your Lordſhip ſhould apprehend any change in my duty, even your diſpleaſure (which I may apprehend upon the miſ-interpreted occaſion) ſhall never give me any of the leaſt receſſion from my duty, in which profeſſion I humbly aske your bleſſing; as

Your Lordſhips

obedient Sonne

Paris 21. Novemb.
1635.

The

The Lord of *Faulklands* Anſwer to a Letter of Mr. *Mountague*, juſtifying his change of Religion, being diſperſed in many Copies.

I Was deſired to give my opinions of the Reaſons, and my Reaſon if I miſliked them; having read and conſidered it, I was brought to be perſwaded.

Firſt, becauſe having been ſometimes in ſome degrees moved with the ſame Inducements, I thought that what ſatisfied me, might poſsibly have the ſame effect upon him.

Secondly, becauſe I being a Lay man, a young man, and an Ignorant man, I thought a little Reaſon might in liklyhood work more from my Pen, then more from theirs, whoſe Profeſsion, Age, and Studies might make him ſuſpect, that it is they are too hard for him, and not their Cauſe for his.

Thirdly, Becauſe I was very deſirous to do him ſervice, not onelie as a man, and a Chriſtian, but as one, whom all that know him inwardly, eſteeme of great parts, (and I am deſirous ſomewhat to make up my great want of them, by my reſpect to thoſe that have them)

them) and as an impartiall seeker of Truth, which I trust he is, and I professe my self to be, and so much for the cause of this Paper: I come now to that which it opposeth.

FIrst then, whereas he defends his search, I suppose he is rather for that to receive praise, then to make Apologies, all men having cause to suspect that gold which were given with this condition, that the Receiver should not trie it by any Touchstone.

Secondly, He saith, that there being two sorts of Questions, the one of Right, or Doctrine, the other of Fact, or Story; As whether the Protestants Faith had a visible appearance before *Luther*, he resolved to begin his enquiry with the matter of Fact, as being sooner to be found, (because but one) and easier to be comprehended: To this I answer, by saying, that if they would not appeale from the Right Tribunall, or rather Rule, which is the Scripture, those many might easier be ended then this one, (we building our Faith onely upon plaine places, and all reasonable men, being sufficient of what is plain) but if they appeal to a consent of Fathers, and Councells, whereof many are lost, many not lost not to be gotten, many uncertaine whether Fathers or no Fathers, and these, which we have, and know, being too many for almost any industrie to read over, and absolutely for any memory to remember, (which yet is necessarie, because any one clause of any one Father, destroies a consent) and being

ing besides liable to all the exceptions which can be brought against the Scriptures, being the Rule, as difficulty, want of an infallible Interpreter, and such like, and being denied to have any infallibility, (especially when they speak not as witnesses, which a consent of them never doth against us) by one partie, which the Scripture is allowed to have by both, then I wonder not if he think such a way so uncertaine, and so long, that he was willing to chuse any shorter cut, rather then travell it: Neither do I beleeve this other to be so short, or so concluding as he imagines, for if he consider the large extent of Christian Religion, so that we know little from any indifferent Relator of the opinions of the *Abissins*, so great a part of Christendome, if he consider the great industry of his Church in extinguishing those whom they have called Hereticks, and also their Books, so that we know scarce any thing of them, but from themselves, (who are too partiall to make good Historians) if he consider how carefully they stop mens mouthes, (even those of their own) with their *Indices expurgatorii*, it will then appear to him both a long work to seek, and a hard one to find, whether any thought like *Luther* in all Ages, and that he concludes very rashly, who resolves that there was none, because he cannot find any, since they might have been visible in their times, and yet not so to us, (for men are not the lesse visible when they are so, for not being after remembered) as a man may be a Gentleman, though he know not his pedigree: So that as I will not

affirm that there were alwaies such, because I cannot prove it, so neither ought they to make themselves sure there were none, without they could prove that which is impossible, and therefore no Argument can be drawn from thence; and if it could be proved, that such a no-waies-erring Church must at all times be, I had rather beleeve that there were still such, though we know them not, which may be true, then that theirs is it, which in my opinion cannot.

Thirdly, He saies that he could find no one point of controverted Doctrine, whereupon all the rest depended, but that this one Question of Fact was such, as the decision of it determined all the rest.

To this I answer, That the Question of the Infallibilitie of the Pope, at least of those who adhere to him, which they call the Church, is such a one, as if determined, must determine all the rest, and not onely to us, but to all men, whereas this (though granted necessarie, and determined to his wish) would indeed conclude against us, but not for them, since the *Greek* Church would put in as good a Plea upon the Title of Visibility, as that of *Rome*, and he would be to begin anew with them when he had ended with us.

Fourthly, He gives his reason, If *Luther* coul be evicted to be the Innovator, his Religio is then evicted of not being the true ancient an and Apostolicall.

To this I answer, by confessing the consequence; but he might be the Renovator, and not the

the Innovator, and then no such consequence followes.

Fifthly, He saies we are bound to find an existence of some Professors of the reformed Religion before *Luther*, which requirie is bound upon his supposition of the necessitie of a continuall succession of a visible, and no-waies erronious Church.

Now I will first examine the sence of his tearms. By the first, I conceive by a place he cites out of Saint *Austine*, that he meanes visible to all Nations, but I pray, hath his been alwaies so, I mean at least (for many Centuries) to those Nations, which *Columbus* hath not long since discovered.

By the second tearm Church, I suppose he meanes a Company of Christians holding neither more, or lesse then Christ taught, (for in a more large sence, no man denies the Church to have been alwaies in some degrees visible) and in this sence, I not onely deny it necessarie, that it should be alwaies visible, but that it should alwaies be, for I doubt whether there be, or for a long while, have been any such.

Next, That such a one he meanes, appeares, because when Catalogues have been brought of some, who in all Ages have differed from them in things which we hold, his side would not accept of them, because they agreed not with us in all things, and yet when *Campian* intends to prove all the Fathers to be his, he useth onely this course of instancing, in some things wherein they agree

with him, (though sometimes not so much, but rather the contrary ought to be inferred, as in the instance of *Polycarpus*, for comparing his words with the Historie, it will appear, that he concluded him a Papist for not being perswaded by the Pope) though they differed from them in many other, as indeed all the notable Fathers did in more then one point. I will therefore say, that if this be required to shewing that a Church hath been ever visible, it is more then either part can do, and therefore I hope they will come upon better consideration to confesse that not necessarie for us to do, which is impossible for themselves. For let any man look into Antiquitie, I will not say without all prejudice, but without an absolute Resolution of seeing nothing in it that contradicts his present beleefe, and if he find not some opinions of the Church of *Rome* as unknown unto Antiquity, as either he, or I; as the Popes Indulgences having power to deliver out of Purgatorie, confest by Bishop *Fisher*, and *Alphonsus de Castro*, where they treat of Indulgences, if he find not others at first unknown, after known, but not held *de fide*, which are so at *Rome*, as *Prayer to Saints*, their enjoying *the Beatificall Vision before the day of Judgement*, *the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, and her being free from all actuall sin*, if he find not some wholly unknown, and absolutely condemned, which we condemne, as the lawfullnesse of Picturing God the Father, whereof the first is confest by *Barronius* in the Margent to an Epistle of a Pope, which saies the same, and the latter to

Tom. 9. An. 726. de fide & Simbol.

2 Lib. C. 2.

be

be found in many places of Saint *Austine*, *Lactantius*, and others, nay if he find not that all the Doctors, Saints, Martyrs of the two first Ages (I mean as many as are now extant, and speak of it) held something, which both parts condemne, as the opinions of the *Chiliasts*; If I say, he find not this, or I shew him not that he might have found it, I professe I will be ready to spend my life for that Church, against which I now employ my Pen: So that this will be the end, neither of your Churches have been alwaies visible, onely the difference is this, that we are most troubled to shew our Church in the Latter, and more corrupt Ages, and they theirs in the first and purest, that we can least find ours at night, and they theirs at Noone. And whereas he expects that Doctor *White* should stand to this, to confesse his Religion false, if a continuall descent of it cannot be demonstrated, if he himself will please to grant as much as he exacts, if he but continue in this resolution, and in this search, I doubt no more but that he will soone leave to be a Papist, then I should doubt if I saw him now receiving the Communion in the Kings Chappell, that he had done it already.

Sixtly, His Reasons for the necessitie of the Visibility follow, because the contrary were a derogation from Gods Power or Providence.

I answer, To say he could not keep the Truth exactly in mens beleefe, were to derogate from Gods Power, to say he had not given sufficient meanes to find the Truth, and yet damned men for

for error, the first would be a derogation from his Providence, the second from his Justice, but to say he suffers men to erre, who neglect the meanes of not erring, and that he damnes none for a meer error, in which the will hath no part, and consequently the man no fault, derogates from none of the three, but saies he, this is repugnant to the maine reason why God hath a Church upon Earth, to be the conserver of the Doctrine of Christ, and to conveigh it from Age to Age.

I answer, To conserve it is every mans duty, but such as they may all faile in, and indeed is rather the the form of the Church, then the end of the Church, an exact conservation making an exact Church, and a lesse perfect conserving, a lesse perfect Church. As for conveighance of Doctrine, the whole Church conveighs none, whereof many (if his be it) have had but little conveighed to them. Particular Christians (especially Pastors) teach others, which it is every mans duty to do when he meets with them who want instruction, which he can give, and they are likely to receive, yet is not the instruction of others every mans maine end.

But Mr. *Mountague* I know perswades him, that some body of men are appointed to conveigh this Doctrine which men are to receive, onely because they deliver it, and this I absolutely deny, for we receive no Doctrine from the Church upon the Churches authority, because we know her not to be the Church, till we have examined her

her Doctrine, and so rather receive her for it, then it for her. Neither for the conveighance of the Truth, is it necessarie that any company of men in all times hold it all, because some may conveigh some Truthes, and others another, out of which, by comparing their Doctrine with the Scripture, men may draw forth a whole and perfect body of Truth, and though they deliver few other Truthes, yet in delivering Scripture (wherein all necessarie Truth is contained) they deliver all, and by that Rule, whosoever regulates his life and Doctrine, I am confident, that though he may mistake Error for Truth in the way, he shall never mistake Hell for Heaven in the end.

Seventhly, His next reason is their common *Achilles*, the fourth of the *Ephesians*, which he chuseth onely to employ like his *Triarios*, his main Battle, leaving his *Velites*, his light-armed Souldiers, some places too allegoricall, even in his own opinion to stand examination.

The words are these,

He hath given some Prophets, some Apostles, some Evangelists, some Pastors, and some Doctors. For the instauration of the Saints, for the work of the Ministery, for the Edification of the body of Christ, till we all meet in the Unity of Faith, and the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, and unto the measure of the Age of the fullnesse of Christ. That we may be no more Children, tost and carried about with every wind of Doctrine, &c. Vers. 11. 12 13

Now out of this place I see not how a Succession may be evinced, rather I think it may, if that

Apostle

Apostle meant none.

For first, He saith not I will give, but he hath given; and who could suppose that the Apostles could say, that Christ had given, then the present Pope and the Doctors who now adhere to him.

Secondly, Allow that by what he hath given, were meant he hath promised, (which would be a glosse not much unlike to that which one of the most wittie, and most eloquent of our Modern Divines, Doctor *Donne*, notes of *Statuimus* (i) *abrogamus*) yet since these severall Nounes are governed by the same Verb, and no distinction put, it would prove as well a necessitie of a continuall Succession of Apostles, Prophets, and Evangelists, as of Pastors, and Doctors, which is more then either they can shew, or pretend they can, so that it seemes to me to follow, that these were then given to do this till then, and not a Succession of them promised, till then to do this, and so we receiving and retaining the Scriptures, wherein what they taught is contained, (as we would any thing else that had as generall and ancient a Tradition, if there were any such) need no more, for if he say that men are tost for all the Scripture, I answer, so are they for all their Doctors, nay, if these keep any from being tost, it is the Scripture which does it, upon which their authoritie is by them founded upon their own Interpretation and Reason, who yet will not give us leave to build any thing upon ours out of plainer places, and though they tell us, that we cannot know the Scriptures but from the Church, they are yet faine

(as

(as appeares) to prove the authoritie of the Church out of Scripture, which makes me ask them in the words of their own *Campian*, and with much more cause *Nihilne pudet Labyrinthi?*

Eighthly, There followes another reason to this sence, that reason not being able to shew man a way to eternall happinesse, and without such a one man would faile of the end to which he was ordained, it must be proposed by an infallible authority in so plaine a manner, as even the simple might be capable of it, which being performed by our Saviour, it must be conveighed to succeeding Ages by those, who heard it from him, and whensoever this thread failed, mankind was left without a Guide to inevitable ruine.

I answer, That though all this granted, it proves not against us, for we have the Scripture come down to us, relating Christs Doctrine, and written by those that heard it, which the simple are capable of understanding, (I mean as much as is plaine, and more is not necessarie, since other Questions may as well be suffered without harme, as those between the *Jesuites* and the *Dominicans* about Prædetermination, and between the *Dominicans* and allmost all the rest about the Immaculate Conception) and those who are not, neither are they capable out of Scripture to discerne the true Church, much lesse by any of those Noteswhich require much understanding and learning, as Conformity with the Ancients, and such like.

Ninethly, The same answer I give to this,

serves also to the following words of Saint *Austine*, for whereas Mr. *Mountague* concludeth, that he could not meane the Scriptures as a competent Rule to mankind, which consisteth most of simple Persons, because there hath been continuall alterations about the sence of important places.

I answer, That I may as well conclude by the same Logick, that neither is the Church a competent Guide, because in all Ages there have also been disputes, not onely about her authority, but even which was she, and to whatsoever reason he imputes this, to the same may we the other, as to Negligence, Pride, Præjudication, and the like, and if he please to search, I verily beleeve he will find, that the Scriptures are both easier to be known then the Church, and that it is as easie to know what these teach, as when that hath defined; since they hold no decrees of hers binding *de Fide*, without a confirmation of the Popes, who cannot never be known infalliblly to be a Pope, because a secret *Simony* makes him none; no not to be a Christian, because want of due intention in the Baptizer makes him none, whereof the latter is alwaies possible, and the first in some ages likely; and in hard Questions a readinesse to yeeld when they shall be explained, me thinks should serve as well as a readinesse to assent to the decrees of the Church, when those shall be pronounced.

Tenthly, He saith that the Scripture must be kept safe in some hands, whose authority must beget our acceptance of it, which being no other then the Church of all ages, we have no more reason to beleeve

beleeve that it hath preserved that free from Corruption, then it self in a continuall visibilitie.

I answer, That neither to giving authority to Scriptures, nor to the keeping of them, is required a continuall visibility of a no-waies erring body of Christians; the Writers of them give them their authority among Christians, nor can the Church move any other, and that they were the Writers, we receive from the generall Tradition and Testimony of the first Christians, not from any following Church, who could know nothing of it but from them, (for for those parts, which were then doubted of by such as were not condemned for it by the rest, why may not we remain in the same suspence of them that they did) and for their being kept and conveighed, this was not done onely by their Church, but by others, as by the *Greeks*, and there is no reason to say, that to the keeping and transmitting of records safely, it is required to understand them perfectly, since the old Testament was kept and transmitted by the *Jewes*, who yet were so capable of erring, that out of it they looked for a Temporall King, when it spoke of a Spirituall; and me thinks the Testimony is greater of a Church which contradicts the Scripture, then of one which doth not, since no mans witnessing is so soon to be taken, as when against himself, and so their Testimonie is more receiveable, which is given to the Scriptures by which themselves are condemned. Besides the generall reverence which ever hath been given to these Books, and the continuall use of

them (together with ſeverall parties, having alwaies their eyes upon each other each deſirous to have ſomewhat to accuſe in their adverſaries) give us a greater certaintie, that theſe are the ſame writings then we have, that any other ancient book is any other ancient Author, and we need not to have any erring Company preſerved to make us ſurer of it: Yet the Church of *Rome*, as infallible a Depoſitarie as ſhe is, hath ſuffered ſome variety to creep into the Coppies in ſome leſſe materiall things, nay, and ſome whole Books (as they themſelves ſay) to be loſt, and if they ſay, how then can that be rule whereof part is loſt? I reply, That wee are excuſed if we walk by all the Rule that we have, and that this maketh as much againſt Traditions being the Rule, ſince the Church hath not looked better to Gods unwritten Word, then to his written, and if ſhe pretend ſhe hath, let her tell us the cauſe why Antichriſts comming was deferred, which was a Tradition of Saint *Paul* to the *Theſſalonians*, and which without impudence ſhe cannot pretend to have loſt? And if againe they ſay, God hath preſerved all neceſſary Tradition. I reply, ſo hath he all neceſſarie Scripture, for by not being preſerved, it became to us not neceſſarie, ſince we cannot be bound to beleeve and follow that we cannot find.

But beſides, I beleeve that which was ever neceſſary is contained in what remaines, for *Pappias* ſaith of Saint *Mark*, that he writ all that Saint *Peter* preacht, as *Irenæus* doth, that *Luke* writ all that

that Saint *Paul* preacht, nay, *Vincentius Lirinenſis*, though he would have the Scripture expounded by ancient Tradition, yet confeſſeth that all is there which is neceſſary, (and yet then there was no more Scripture then we now have) as indeed by ſuch a Tradition as he ſpeakes of, no more can be proved then is plainly there, and almoſt all Chriſtians conſent in; and truely I wonder, that they ſhould brag ſo much of that Author, ſince both in this and other things, he makes much againſt them, as eſpecially in not ſending men to the preſent *Roman* Church for a Guide, a much readier way, (if he had known it) then ſuch a long and doubtfull Rule, as he preſcribes, which indeed it is impoſſible that almoſt any Queſtion ſhould be ended by.

Eleventhly, He brings Saint *Auſtines* authority to prove, that the true Church muſt be alwaies viſible; but if he underſtood Church in Mr *Mountagues* ſence, I think he was deceived, neither is this impudent for me to ſay, ſince I have cauſe to think it but his particular opinion, by his ſaying (which Cardinall *Perron* quoted) that before the *Donatiſts*, the Queſtion of the Church had never been exactly diſputed of, and by this, being one of his maine grounds againſt them; and yet claiming no Tradition, but onely places of Scripture, moſt of them allegoricall, and if it were no more, I may better diſſent from it, then he from all the firſt Fathers, (for *Dionyſius Areopagita* was not then hatcht) in the point of the *Chiliaſts*, though ſome of them (*Pappias* and *Ireneus*) claimed

claimed a direct Tradition, and Christs owne words.

Secondly, As useth this kind of libertie, so he professeth it in his nineteenth Epistle, where he saith, that to Canonicall Scriptures he had learnt to give the reverence, as not to doubt of what they said, because they said it, from all others he expected proofe from Scripture or Reason.

Thirdly, The Church of *Rome* condemnes severall opinions of his, and therefore she ought not to find fault with them who imitate her example.

Twelfthly, He addes two reasons more, *The consent of the Fathers of all ages*, *And the confession of Protestants*.

To the First I answer, That I know not of any such, and am the more unapt to beleeve it, because Mr. *Mountague* vouchsafes not to insist upon it, nor to quote any, which I guesse he would have done, but that he misdoubted their strength.

Secondly, Suppose that all the Fathers which speake of this, did say so, yet if they say it but as private Doctors, and claime no Tradition, I know not why they should weigh more then so many of the now learned, who having more helpes from Arts, and no fewer from Nature, are not worse searchers into what is Truth, though lesse capable of being Witnesses to what was Tradition.

Thirdly, They themselves often professe they expect not to be read as Judges, but as to be judged by their and our Rule, the Canonicall Scriptures.

Fourth-

Fourthly, Let him pleaſe to read about the Immaculate Conception *Roſa Salmeron*, and *Wadding*, and he will find me as ſubmiſſive to Antiquity, even whilſt I rejéct it, as thoſe of their own Party; for they to prefer new opinions before old, are faine to prefer new Doctors before old, and to confeſſe the latter more perſpicatious, and to differ from thoſe of former times, with as little ſcruple as he would from *Calvin*, (whom *Maldonat*, on purpoſe to oppoſe, confeſſeth he chuſeth a new Interpretation, before that of all the Ancients, which no witneſſe but my eyes could have made me beleeve) nay, and produce other points wherein their Church hath decreed againſt the Fathers, to perſwade her to do ſo againe, althoug *Campian* with an eloquent brag, would perſwade us, that they are all as much for him, as *Gregory* the thirteenth who was then Pope. *6 Cap. St. Johan.*

To the Second I anſwer, That Infallibility is not by us denied to the Church of *Rome*, with an intention of allowing it to particular Proteſtants, how wiſe and learned ſoever.

Thirteenthly, He ſaies next, that he after reſolved to inform himſelf in other points which ſeemed to him unwarrantable, and ſuperſtitious, and found onely his own miſtakes gave him occaſion of Scandall.

To this I anſwer, That I cannot well anſwer any thing, unleſſe he had ſpecified the points, but I can ſay that there are many, as picturing God the Father, (which is generally thought lawfull, and as generally practiſed) their offerings to the

the Virgin *Mary*, (which onely differs from the Hereſie of the *Colliridians*, in that a Candle is not a Cake) their praying to Saints, and beleeving *de fide* that they heare us, though no way made certaine that they do ſo, and many more, which without any miſtake of his might have given him occaſion to be ſtill ſcandalized: For whereas he ſaith that thoſe points were grounded upon the authority of the ancient Fathers, which was refuſed as inſufficient by Proteſtants.

I anſwer, That none of theſe I name have any ground in the Ancienteſt, nay, the firſt is by them diſallowed, and if any other ſuperſtition of theirs have from them any ground, yet they who depart from ſo many of the Ancients in ſeverall opinions, cannot by any reaſon be excuſed for retaining any error, becauſe therein they conſent, nor have the Proteſtants cauſe to receive it from them as a ſufficient Apologie, neither hath he to follow the Fathers rather then Proteſtants, in a cauſe, in which not the Perſons, but the Reaſons, were to have been conſidered. For when Saint *Hierome* was by this way both brought into, and held in a ſtrange error, though he ſpeakes ſomething like Mr. *Mountague*, *Patiaris me errare cum talibus*, Suffer me to erre with ſuch men, yet he could not obtaine Saint *Auſtines* leave, who would not ſuffer him, but anſwered their Reaſons, and neglected their Authorities.

Fourteenthly, He ſpeakes of his Religion ſuper-infuſing Loyalty, and if he had onely ſaid it deſtroied or weakned it not, I (who wiſh that no

no doubt of his alleagiance may once enter his mind, to whom we all owe it, but profeſſe my ſelf his humble Servant, and no waies his enemy, though his adverſarie) would then made no anſwer, but ſince he ſpeakes as if Popery were the way to obedience, I cannot but ſay, that though no Tenet of their whole Church (which I know) make at all againſt it, yet there are prevailing opinions on that ſide, which are not fit to make good ſubjects, when their King and they are of different perſwaſions. For beſides that Cardinall *D' oſſat* (an Author which Mr. *Mountague*, I know, hath read, becauſe whoſoeuer hath but conſidered State matters, muſt be as well skilled in him, as any Prieſt in his Breviary) tell us, that it is the *Spaniards Maxime*, That Faith is not to be kept amongſt Hereticks, and more, that the Pope intimated as much in a diſcourſe, intended to perſwade the King of *France* to forſake the Queen of *England*; he ſaith moreover, ſpeaking in another place, ſpeaking about the *Marquizat* of *Saluces*, that they hold at *Rome*, that the Pope, to avoid a probable danger of the encreaſing of Hereſie, may take a Territory from the true Owner, and diſpoſe of it to another, and many alſo defend, that he hath power to depoſe an Hereticall Prince, and of Hereſie he makes himſelf the Judge; So that though I had rather my tongue ſhould cleave to the roofe of my mouth, then that I ſhould deny that a Papiſt may be a good Subject, even to a King whom he accounts an Heretick, ſince I verily beleeve, that I my ſelf know very many, very

good: yet Popery is like to an ill aire, wherein though many keep their healthes, yet many are infected, (ſo that at moſt they are good Subjects but during the Popes pleaſure) and the reſt are in more danger, then if they were out of it.

To conclude, I beleeve that what I have ſaid may at leaſt ſerve (if he will deſcend to conſider it) to move Mr. *Mountague* to a further ſearch, and for *Memorandums* in it, which if it do, he will be ſoone able to give as much better Reaſons for my concluſion, (that ſuch a Viſible Church neither need, nor can be ſhewed) as his underſtanding is degrees above mine. I hope alſo by comparing the body of their beleefe, and the ground of their authority, the little that can be drawn out of the fourth of the *Epheſians*, with the Miriads of contradiction in Tranſubſtantiation, he will come to ſee, that their Pillars are too weak to hold up any building, be it never ſo light, and their building is too heavie to be held up by any Pillars, be they never ſo ſtrong, and truſt he will return to us, whom he will find that he hath cauſeleſſely left, if he be (which I doubt not) ſo ingenuous, as not to hold an opinion, becauſe he hath turned to it, nor to ſtay, onely becauſe he went.

FINIS.

wee must not determine what god can
doe, or fancie him like to our selues
263 264
wee and not god the author of our dam=
nation 266.
whither the protestants had any visible
professors before Luther, hard to
finde why? 280 281
of the church and her visibility 283.
284 285
the scriptures easier to be known
than the church. 290 291
wee are not worse searchers into
what is truth, than the fathers
were, but wee are less capable of
being witnesses what is tradition
294
papists reject the fathers, when
they make not for their turn 295
296.
popish loyaltie 297 298

one defended beating of his father, because it had been the antient custome of the family 175

Decency alone, doth not proue the church of Rome a good guide 177 178

popish sanctitie more conspicuous among vs, then in their own countries 179

wee began no new doctrine 180

eloquence doth rather lead men to speak improperly, then the want of it 183 184

the church most troubled with error, which she would vndertake to secure others from 195

he that is desirous to finde the truth, and vse the means is safe 197 198 257

god values more the heart, then the head 200 201

a Doctrine is not therefore true because conformable to that of the fathers 206

truth is not easier to finde now, then in the fathers time 211

the church of Rome require not only ioyning with her in comunion, but also in opinions 214

the popish vnity not so great as they pretend to 239

2 churches may condemn one another to be none of the church, and yet both be parts of it 249

of pelagius and calvin 126.
the first and purest ages had no pictures 130
not so great an outcry when romish errors were admitted, as when expelled 131
valentian brought in polygamy among xtians without opposition 134
what makes a heretique 138
the papists know not in what yeer, in what age, many things which they confess errors began 142
many in alleged voyd of workes, and live as yt god were obliged to them for their faith 145
there is as much folly beyound wisdome, as on this side 147
we must conclude that convenient, which god hath done 150
the church not to be obeyed, when she exceed her commission 150
some churches in the primitive times, received more for scripture then the roman church did. ergo the church of rome was not their rule 169
How much concerning the scripture was left to tradition 170
How people may be brought to embrace errors 172.
the Jews misled by tradition 172 173

nicephorus callistus affirme that petrus gnaphe
a heretique about 500 years after xt, brought
into the publique liturgie prayers to the
virgin mary 83 84
yf the churches definitions were the rule of
faith, the disciples and apostles of xt would
haue taught vs so much 85 86.
whither the churches number of traditions
be finite, and yf so, why the church of Rome
doe not teach them all at once 86.
no tradition that the church of Rome
must necessarily be followed by all
other churches, is cleer by cyprian and
others opposing her 87 88 89 90
in religion wee haue 2 lights, scripture
and vniuersall tradition 95
it was not necessary that one age should
ioyn to teach an error 100 101
differences betwixt the scotists and
Dominicans 108 Dominicans and Jesuites
and what course pope clement tooke, to
finde which part held the truth 108
Bp fisher and Alphonsus de castro affirme
the church of Rome hold many things now, as
points of faith, which were vnknown to
the antient fathers 109 110 111 112 113
114
salmeron quotes a spurious piece of aug: for the
assumption of the virgin mary 112
men will scarce resist opinions, when there is no
probable means of doing good by it 123

the church of Rome cannot pretend all her
doctrine was receiued from her fathers 56
57 59 60
the Graecians pretend to tradition no lesse
then the Romans 61
some doctrines which were not once, are now
doctrines of faith 63
things beleeued conuenient, may in short
time be thought necessary 63 64
no vniuersall tradition for the imaculate
conception of the virgin Mary 65 66.
Turnbull affirmes the churches supreme
diffinition of matters of faith is the infal-
lible word of god 68
the fathers that condemned origen, could
not thinke tradition a fit rule to proceed
by 69 70
the chiliasts had tradition on their side,
and yet the Romanists count them
Heretiques 71 73 74
the papists must proue their infallibility
in euery point they confute vs, but it is
sufficient for vs to shew their fallibility in
any one point 73.
an Arrian will desire to haue his cause
tried by those authors that liued be-
fore the question arose, so that it seems
there is no such tradition as papists
dream of against them 77 78

Romes propertie to couer things newly found
with antient termes treatiof infallibilitie 23
I may learn though not of a wiser, yet of a better
witness then my selfe, in the answre 4
no error can fall in a speculatiue point of faith,
but it will haue a practicall effect in the answre
11
wee must not expect in any art or science,
more exactness then the nature of it affoardeth
ans: 14
the church euer visible answ: 20 in principio
what the catholick church calls tradition ans:
22 23
the scripture notable to proue euery thing in
foro contentioso ans. 32
the people in Italie and Spain comended
for building their faith not so much vpon
the scripture, as vpon their preists. ans: 33
diuers great catholick diuines fall into errors
and their bookes forbidden why 36
Difference betwixt Roman and protestant
vnitie answ. 40 41
Catholicks only relie vpon tradition ans. 44
Doubting in religion yf not will full, is not
culpable ans: 45
an aduersary in these dayes who doe not
mix gall with his inke deserue thankes in the
reply 51 52
wee must seek, but god only can enable vs to finde
54
wee should be as ready to part with our confuted
opinions, as with our ragged cloaths 54